Tutamen Evangelicum:

OR, A

DEFENCE

OF

Scripture-Ordination,

Againſt the

EXCEPTIONS of *T. G.*

In a Book Intituled,

Tentamen Novum,

Proving, That

Ordination by Presbyters is Valid;

Timothy and *Titus* were no Dioceſan Rulers;

The Presbyters of *Epheſus* were the Apoſtles Succeſſors in the Government of that Church, and not *Timothy*;

The Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was Written before the Meeting at *Miletus*;

The Ancient *Waldenſes* had no Dioceſan Biſhops, *&c.*

James Owen

By the Author of the Plea for Scripture-Ordination.

Confirmatio juvenum, Clericorum Ordinatio, locorum Conſecratio reſervatur Papæ & Epiſcopis propter cupiditatem lucri temporalis & honoris. Art. 28. Doctr. Joh. Wiclef. in Conc. Conſtantienſ.

London: Printed for *Zachary Whitworth*, Bookſeller in *Manchester*, 1697.

3

THE PREFACE.

J. O. *Publiſhed ſome Years ſince,* A Plea for Scripture-Ordination, *Proving by Scripture and Antiquity, That Ordination by Presbyters, without Biſhops, is Valid.*

Several Hands were ſaid to be at Work, preparing Remarks upon it; at length, after near Three Years Silence, comes forth a ſort of Anſwer, by one Mr. T. G. Rector *of* B. *in* Lancaſhire, *an Author well known in his Countrey, by ſome* Prerogative Sermons, *which he Printed ſome Years ſince.*

1. *He Fronts his* Engliſh *Book with a* Latine *Title, and calls it* Tentamen Novum, *that is,* A new Tryal of Skill. *Here is an implicit Confeſſion of a baffled Cauſe; he dare not truſt to the* Old Arguments *for Epiſcopacy, but is glad to betake himſelf to* New Shifts. *It's a deſperate Cauſe that needs* new Arts *to ſupport it.*

The plain Engliſh of Tentamen Novum *is this:* Gentlemen, I am very ſenſible the

Cauſe I Plead for cannot ſtand on its old Foundations; therefore I will make a *New Effort*, and *try*, Whether the lofty Fabrick of Dioceſan Epiſcopacy may not be Supported on the Slender and Nice Foundations of a new Point of Chronology. If this fails, the Cauſe is loſt.

However, his Title looks a little Modeſt, but a Man of Aſſurance *cannot be long Conceal'd under a Vizard, for in the very next Words he calls his Argument a* Demonſtration. *For thus his Title-Page runs*; Tentamen Novum, Proving that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Dioceſan Rulers, by an Argument drawn frhm the time of St. *Paul*'s beſeeching *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, and leaving *Titus* at *Crete*, as it is demonſtrated by Biſhop *Pearſon*.

A Doubtful Attempt, *and a* Confident Demonſtration, *are ſomething inconſiſtent. But I have been ſo kind to him as to Reconcile the* Title-Page *to the* Title *of his Book, by proving his Suppoſed* Demonſtration *to be only a* Tentamen Novum, *a* new *and fruitleſs* Attempt, *to defend an* Un-ſcriptural Hierarchy. *This the Reader may find in the Third and Fourth Chapter of this Book.*

II. *I deſire the Reader to obſerve, That there is but one Chapter* (Chap. V.) *in the Rector's Book, which he calls an Anſwer to* J. O's Plea, *and in that he briefly touches upon Two or Three of* Ten Arguments, *which* J. O.

O. *has urged for Ordination by Presbyters. This is* Tentamen Novum, *a new way of Answering Books. He pretends to Answer* J. O's Plea for Scripture-Ordination, *which is the Running-Title of the whole Book, and so would persuade his* Reader *that he has Answer'd the whole.*

I will not impeach his Candour in this Form of Speech, which shews his Skill in a Rhetorical Figure, that Substitutes a Part for the whole: As if a vain-glorious Captain, who had Attack'd a Company or two, should say by a Romantick Synecdoche, *he had beaten an Army.*

III. *The Design of his Book is to prove, That meer Presbyters have no Inherent Power of Ordination; and that all Ordinations by Presbyters are a Nullity. This Notion is very singular, and I hope has but few Patrons in the Church of* England, *because,*

1. *It Un-churches all the Reformed Churches beyond Sea, who have no Bishops of the* English *Species, and by this Gentleman's Principles, no Ministry, no Sacraments, and consequently no Salvation. He owns a true Ministry in the Popish Church, and overthrows the Ministry of the Reformed Churches. His Neighbours of the* Romish Communion *are obliged to conn him Thanks for the Service he would have done to their Cause against the Reformed Interest. To say,* Theirs is a Case of Necessity, but so is not ours, *is to trifle,*

as J. O. *hath prov'd in his Book, but Mr.* G. *wiſely paſſed over that Chapter, as if it were not there.*

2. *This uncharitable Hypotheſis contradicts the Moderate and Learned Defenders of Epiſcopacy, who generally grant the Validity of Ordination by Presbyters, though they judge it irregular where Biſhops may be had.*

Mr. Hooker *allows the Ordination of Presbyters alone, on this Principle, That the Church can give them Power, for according to him all Power is originally in the whole Body.* Eccl. Polit. VII. p. 37, 38.

Biſhop Downame *grants, That* extraordinarily, in caſe of neceſſity, Presbyters may ordain *without Biſhops, and gives this Reaſon for the Validity of their Ordination; becauſe Impoſition of Hands in Confirmation, and Reconciliation of Penitents, were reſerv'd to Biſhops, as well as Ordination, and yet in the abſence of Biſhops may be done by Presbyters.* Def. of his Conſ. Serm. III. 3. P. 69, 108.

Forbes *acknowledges, That* Jure Divino *Presbyters have the Power of Ordaining, as well as of Preaching and Baptizing, though they muſt uſe it under the Biſhop's Inſpection, in thoſe places that have Biſhops.* Iren. p. 164.

The ſame was the Judgment of Arch-Biſhop Uſher. *See his* Life *and* Reduct. *by Dr.* Bernard. *The Arch-Biſhop of* Spalato *ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe.* De Rep. Eccleſ. *in ſeveral places.*

places. He ſaith, That the Presbyterial Order hath always the Keys annexed, and that when any is Ordain'd Presbyter, the Keys are given him, and Juriſdiction with Orders, by Divine Right. *Lib.* V. *Cap.* 12. *p.* 473.

3. *This Hypotheſis condemns the very Church of* England, *who in her Articles* (*Compoſed by the Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, and the Clergy in Convocation, and Confirm'd by Parliament,* 13. Eliz. 12.) *allows the Ordinations of the Reformed Churches beyond Sea, which are by Presbyters.*

Art. 23. Thoſe we ought to Judge lawfully Call'd and Sent, which be choſen and call'd to this Work by Men who have Publick Authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and ſend Miniſters into the Lord's Vineyard *. * *Vid. Rog. in Prop.* 5.

The Article doth not ſay, None are Lawfully call'd but by Biſhops, *but that Miniſters ought to be* Call'd by Men who have publick Authority given unto them in the Congregation, *which Ordaining Presbyters may have, and actually have in the* Foreign Reform'd Congregations

The Church of England *acknowledged Ordinations by Presbyters, and look'd upon Superiour Biſhops to be but* a prudential Conſtitution of the Civil Magiſtrate, *as* J. O. *hath prov'd at large in his Book,* Cap. IX. *which Mr.* G. *alſo prudently overlooks. We may*

preſume he hath good Reaſon *for his* Omiſſions.

The Ordinations of Foreign Churches were not Queſtion'd here before Biſhop Laud's *time. My Lord* Bacon *complains of it, as a new thing, and uncommon in his days.* Some indiſcreet Perſons, *ſaith he*, have been told * in open Preaching, to uſe derogatory Speech and Cenſure of the Churches abroad, and that ſo far, as ſome of our Men, as I have heard, Ordain'd in Foreign Parts, have been pronounced to be no Lawful Miniſters †.

* *Forte Leg. Bold.*

† *Refuſe.* Part I. P. 137.

The Jus Divinum *of Epiſcopacy began to be urged about that time, to the great Joy and Advantage of the Popiſh Party, as appears by a Letter to a Popiſh Peer in* Ireland, *from* T. White, *Dat.* Lond. Feb. 12. 1639. *in which are theſe Words.* We be in a fair way e'er long, to Aſſwage Hereſie and her Epiſcopacy, for *Exetor*'s Book hath done more for the Catholicks than they could have done themſelves: For having written that Epiſcopacy in Office and Juriſdiction is abſolutely *Jure Divino*, which was the old Quarrel between our Biſhops, and K. *H.* VIII. (during his Hereſie) then diſputed upon, which Book doth not a little trouble our Adverſaries, who declare this Tenent of *Exetor*'s to be contrary to the Laws of the Land.

This

This Letter was found, with other Papers, at the taking of Droghedah, *after the Rout of* Remines. Copia vera ab Origin. ut fuit cum Hen. Midenſ. Epiſcopo.

The Book which White *refers to, is Biſhop* Hall's *Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, which was alter'd, and put into the Form in which we now have it, by Arch-Biſhop* Laud. *Biſhop* Hall's *firſt Draught, call'd,* Epiſcopacy an Ancient, Holy, and Divine Inſtitution, *the Arch-Biſhop directed him to alter it into,* So Ancient, as that it is of Divine Inſtitution. Hall *defined Epiſcopacy,* by being joyn'd with Imparity and Superiority of Juriſdiction, Laud *directs him to define it by* a diſtinction of Order. Hall *grants that the* Presbyterian Government may be of uſe where Epiſcopacy may not be had. Laud *tells him* this is of dangerous Conſequence, *and that we muſt not uſe any* mincing Terms, *nor hamper our ſelves for fear of ſpeaking plain Truth, though it be againſt* Amſterdam *or* Geneva.

The Biſhop of Exon *found good Cauſe (ſaith my Author *) to Correct the Obliquity of his Opinion, according to the Rules of theſe Animadverſions.*

* *Dr. Heyl. Life of A. Biſh. Laud,* p. 400, 401, 402.

Biſhop Hall's *Book being finiſhed, the Arch-Biſhop read it over with care and diligence. In the peruſal of which, he took notice amongſt other things, That the ſtrict Superſtition of the* Sabbatarians, *was but lightly touch'd at;*

whereas

whereas he thought, that ſome ſmarter Plaiſter to that Sore might have done no harm. He obſerved alſo, that he had paſſed by this Point, viz. Whether Epiſcopacy be an Order or a Degree, *as not material: Whereas, in the Judgment of ſuch Learned Men as he had conſulted, it was the main ground of the whole Cauſe, and therefore deſir'd him to alter it with his own Pen. But that which gave him moſt offence was, That the Title of Antichriſt was poſitively and determinately beſtowed on the Pope, which he allow'd not of.*

According to which good advice, ſaith Dr. Heylin, *the Biſhop of* Exon *qualified ſome of his Expreſſions, and deleted others.* ubi ſupr. p. 406. *It is remarkable, that at the ſame time that the* Divine Right *of Epiſcopacy began to be aſſerted here, the Divine Right of the* Chriſtian Sabbath *was call'd in queſtion, and the Conſciencious Obſervers of it were branded with the odious Name of* Sabbatarians. *At the ſame time alſo, the old Doctrine of the Church of* England, That the Pope is Anti-Chriſt, *began to be out of requeſt.*

4. *This Hypotheſis condemns the late Epiſcopal Church of* Scotland, *which admitted Ordination by Presbyters to be valid, as Dr.* Burnet, *Biſhop of* Sarum *affirms. Thus he*: The Biſhops of *Scotland* never required the Presbyterian Miniſters there to take Epiſcopal Ordination; they required them only to come and act with them in Church-Judicatories.

catories. Even Arch-Biſhop *Sharp* himſelf, when he was to be Conſecrated Arch-Biſhop of *St. Andrews*, ſtood out for ſome time here in *England*, before he would ſubmit to take Prieſt's Orders. —— No Biſhop during my ſtay in that Kingdom, ever did ſo much as deſire any of the Presbyterians to be Re-ordained *.

* *Biſhop of* Sarum's *Vindic.* p. 84, 85. *Lond.* 1696

The advancing of an Hypotheſis ſo favourable to the Romiſh *Church, ſo deſtructive to the* Reformed *Churches abroad, ſo inconſiſtent with the Articles of the Church of* England, *(which Mr.* G. *hath ſubſcribed) and ſo contrary to the Practice of the Scottiſh Biſhops, and the repeated Declarations of ſeveral of our Engliſh Biſhops, may tempt Perſons to ſuſpect the deſign of the Book, if not of the Author. But we will charitably hope he meant well, and in a tranſport of Zeal, which excludes freedom of thought, might eaſily over-look the fatal Conſequences of his indigeſted Principles.*

IV. *He tells us a long Story in his Preface of the occaſion of his publiſhing of his Book,* p. 1. *and* 2. *and complains* that his Sermon of the Conſecration and Holineſs of Churches *has not been Anſwered by the Diſſenters,* and, *ſaith he,* there is good reaſon for it, which I ſhall not here repeat. *To* repeat *a thing not mentioned before is a little improper. I confeſs there is* good Reaſon *why that Sermon has not been anſwered, and that is,* his not Printing it; *let him Publiſh it, and he ſhall not*

long

long complain, That that Controverſie is dropt.

I am a Stranger to that Sermon, but I expect he ſhould prove the Conſecration and Holineſs of Churches *by the Scripture, for he allows* (Pref. p. 13.) That we ought to be Govern'd by Scripture, and to keep cloſe to Scripture-practice. *I am ſure he cannot prove it from the New Teſtament, which is the peculiar Law of Chriſt, and the Rule of Chriſtians. It doth not appear, that Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, ever Conſecrated any Places of Worſhip. Nor can he prove it from the Old Teſtament. By the* Ceremonial Law (*which in the main Branches of it was more Ancient than* Moſes, *and expired with the Jewiſh Temple*) *our publick Churches are ſo far from being* holy, *that they are* unclean, *becauſe the Dead are buried there. He that touched a* Grave *was unclean by the old* Law, Num. 19. 16. *The Jews buried their Dead not in their Temple, or Synagogues, but in places appropriated to that uſe, which they accounted unclean. They buried ordinarily without the Cities*, Lu. 7. 12 *.

**Vid. Ligh.* vol. II. p. 323.

Their Synagogues, *which anſwer to our Pariſh Churches, were not Conſecrated as the Temple was: nor was there any Law for the Conſecration of them, nor of their* Divinity-Schools, *which they judged more Holy than their Synagogues* ||.

||*Maim. in Godw. Moſes and Aaron*, II. 2.

Optatus *obſerves, That the* Donatiſts *began to bury in Churches in his time, and adds*, That it

it was not Lawful to Bury in the Houſe of God *. *He ſeems to refer to a Law of* Gratian *the Emperor, as* Baldwin *obſerves in his Annotations on* Optatus.

* *Ad Parm.* lib. 3. p. 36

The pureſt Ages of Chriſtianity had no Conſecrated Temples nor Altars ||. *For this Reaſon* Cæcilius *in* Minucius Fœlix, *reproaches the Chriſtians, and asks,* Cur nullas Aras habent, nulla Templa? *Why have they no Altars, no Temples, no viſible Images* †? Minucius *anſwers,* What Temple can I build unto Him, whom the World, which is Created by His Power, cannot contain? And ſince I, a Man, dwell more at large, ſhall I include ſo great a Majeſty within one little Houſe? Is He not better Conſecrated in the bottom of onr Hearts *?

|| *Arnob. adv. Gent.* lib. VI.

† *Min. Fœl. Octav.* p. 29. *Oxon.*

* *Ibid.* p. 94.

To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks Clemens Alexandrinus; He that is endued with Knowledge, *ſaith he,* Honours God, that is, gives Thanks for the knowledge of an upright Life, neither in a definitive place, nor in a ſelect Temple, nor on certain ſtated Feſtivals, but through his whole Life, and in every place. *And a little after,* Every place is truly Sacred in which we Converſe with God ||.

|| *Strom.* 7.

The Heathen built their Temples *upon the* Graves, *or Aſhes of their Dead, as* Arnobius *affirms* †. *For this reaſon* Clemens Alexandrinus *calls them* Sepulchers; You call them, *ſaith he,* by the ſpecious Name of Temples,

† Lib. VI.

Temples, but they were Sepulchers, that is, Sepulchers were call'd Temples *.

* *In* προτρεπ.

These they dedicated by certain Ceremonies to the Memory of their deceas'd Friends, whom they honoured as Gods, and accounted their Temples Sacred, as Cæcilius *speaks* ||. *He complains that the Christians despised them as polluted Graves* †. *The wiser sort of Heathens acknowledged, that their* Consecrated Temples *had no real Holiness in them. No Edifice, saith* Plato *in* Clemens Alexandrinus, *is of* any great worth, or truly Holy, that is built by sordid Mechanicks *.

|| *Ubi supr.* p. 18, 19.

† p. 25.

**Strom.* V.

In imitation of them the Christians, as they degenerated from the Apostolical Simplicity, built Temples in honour of departed Saints and Martyrs. They call'd their Temples after their Names, Dedicated them to such and such Saints, in Memory of which they kept Festivals, *which gave occasion to our* Wakes. *We have some Instances of these Dedications and Festivals in the Fourth Century.* Euseb. Vit. Constant. IV. Nazian. Orat. in Nov. Dominic.

No Instance can be given of any Dedication of Temples *till about* Constantine's *time, and the Dedications of that Age were no* Ceremonious Consecrations; *they were only celebrated with Solemn Prayers, Praises, Preaching, and Administring the Eucharist, which are the stated Duties to be performed in such places. The first performance of these Religious Duties can have no more Vertue for Consecration of the Place,*

Place, than the continued Series of them. Euſebius *mentions alſo ſome Orations in Commendation of the Benefactor, and the Magnificency of the Structure, which were delivered at thoſe Solemnities* *. *Theſe had no Conſecrating Vertue in them.* *Vit. Conſt. IV. 45.

Ceremonious Conſecrations appropriated unto Biſhops, *were unknown in the three firſt Centuries.*

I find but one Inſtance of it in the Fourth Century, and that in the Roman Church, *in which Superſtitions grew faſter than in other Churches, and this inſtance is very dubious. The* Roman *Council under* Sylveſter *is ſaid to Decree,* That no Presbyter preſume to Celebrate Maſs, but in Places Conſecrated by the Biſhop ||. ||*Epit. Syn. Rom. Sub. Sylveſt.*

The Acts of this Council are juſtly ſuſpected to be Spurious, for certain the Twentieth Canon, which forbids Judging the firſt Seat *is ſo.* Vid. Conc. Nicen. Can. 6..

Above a hundred Years after, A. D. 456. *an* Iriſh *Council under St.* Patrick *determin'd,* That no Presbyter, who had built a Church, do offer *(the Euchariſtic Sacrifice)* until he bring the Biſhop to Conſecrate it, C. 23.

About the Year 494. *the Power of Conſecrating Churches, which the Biſhops had before appropriated to themſelves, was reſtrained to Metropolitans by Pope* Gelaſius †. † *Ep.* IX. c. 4. & 25.

In the Year 619. *the Second Council of* Sevil *acknowledges, That the Conſecration of Churches*

Churches is forbidden Presbyters, Novellis & Ecclesiasticis regulis, *by certain new Ecclesiastical Canons* *.

*Con. Hisp. 2 Can. 7.

The Consecration of Altars *is almost as ancient as the Consecration of* Churches. *It is mention'd about the Year of Christ* 506. *in the Council of* Agatha, Can. 10. & 29. *and about the Year* 563. *in the Council of* Braga ||.

|| Conc. Bracar. Can. 37.

For the same reason that we have laid aside the Consecration of Altars, *we may also that of* Churches.

We conceive that all places are equally near to Heaven, and that all Places where the Worship of God is Celebrated, are equally Holy. God looks more on the disposition of the Worshipper, than he doth on the place of Worship †, *as* Austin *well speaks.*

†Aug. de Unit. Cap. 16.

1. *Mr.* G. *will do well to shew us,* 1. *some Warrant from the New Testament, for Consecration and Holiness of Places, which he seems so fond of.*

2. *When he hath done that, let him shew us what Authority from the New Testament the Bishops have to appropriate the Consecration of Churches to their Order. Did* Timothy *or* Titus, *whom he calls Bishops, Consecrate Churches?*

3. *If the Gospel give them no such Power, can he shew any Canons made since the Reformation, that do impower them to Consecrate Places of Worship. We have Forms for the* Ordering *of Priests and Deacons, and for the Consecrating of Bishops and Arch-Bishops; we have*

have a Form for Confirmation alſo: but no Form, nor Order, nor Direction, about the Conſecration of Churches that ever I cou'd meet with. Indeed the Roman Pontifical *can ſupply us with one.*

Dr. Heylin *tells us, that Arch-Biſhop* Laud *had a deſign to draw up an* Engliſh Pontifical, *to be approv'd by the Convocation, in the Year* 1640. *This new* Pontifical *was to contain, among other things, a Form to be obſerved by all Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops, for Conſecrating Churches, Church-Yards, and Chapels* *. *But the Troubles of the Time obliged him to defer the proſecution of it till a fitter conjuncture. When King* Charles II. *returned, and the Biſhops had all the advantage they could deſire, they did not proſecute the deſign, not being ſo violent in that Point, as* Laud *and his Party had been.*

* *Laud's* Life, p. 441.

4. *Wherein doth a* Conſecration *promote the acceptance of our Devotions with God? Is the Worſhip of God more acceptable in a Conſecrated, than in an Unconſecrated Place? If it be not, what are we the better for Conſecration? If it be, let the Rector prove it. Can he ſhew any Promiſe that is made to Conſecrated Places as ſuch, under the Goſpel? He cannot produce either a Command or Precedent for Conſecration of Places under the Goſpel, nor a Promiſe to ſuch Places above others. Jeſus Chriſt Promiſes to meet his People in all places, without diſtinction,* Mat. 18. 20. *John* 4. 21, 23.

1 Tim. 2. 8. He dwelleth not in material Temples, *Acts* 7. 49. *and* 17. 24.

The Rector hath studied this Subject, and can resolve these Difficulties, which we shall expect in his Celebrated Consecration-Sermon.

V. *But to return to the main Subject. Our Author would say something, if he knew what, for the* Jus Divinum *of Episcopacy, but his Discourse is so cloudy, confused, and inconsisten', that it is hard to imagine what he drives at in several places.*

His Book consists of Five Chapters.

1. *In the first Chapter he endeavours to prove that none but Apostles and Prophets did Ordain. Suppose this were granted him, which I have prov'd to be false, I cannot see what advantage he can make of it; for Bishops are neither Apostles nor Prophets. He himself makes 'em* Evangelists, *which are different from Apostles and Prophets,* Eph. 4. 11.

2. *In the second Chapter he would prove, That St.* Paul, *towards the declining part of his Life, made* Timothy *and* Titus *Bishops of* Ephesus *and* Crete. *In Answer to which, I have fully prov'd, from* Acts 20. *That the Government of the Church of* Ephesus, *and by undeniable consequence of all other Churches, was committed to the Presbyters in Parity, and not to one Supreme President.*

I have evidenced this Government to be Divine, Perpetual, and an apt Remedy against Schism. I have shew'd that it was settled by the

the Apoſtle, when he could Over-ſee that Church no more, and had no proſpect of ever ſeeing it again.

It's pretended by the late Aſſerters of Epiſcopacy, That the Apoſtles when they took their laſt leave of the Churches, ſettled Biſhops for their Succeſſors to preſide over the Presbyters, as a Remedy againſt the growing Schiſms. *I have demonſtrated from the* 20th *of the* Acts, *That it is quite otherwiſe, that St.* Paul *left the Presbyters of* Epheſus *as his* ordinary Succeſſors *in the Government of that Church, and that in proſpect of* Schiſms, *and of his* final departure *from them.*

The evidence of this Eſtabliſhment is ſo bright and convincing, that our Author cannot but acknowledge it, p. 47. *and the poor ſhifts which he uſeth there to avoid the force of this unanſwerable Argument, ſhews the power of Intereſt and Temptation upon ſelf-convicted minds.*

The Proofs for Timothy's *being Biſhop of* Epheſus, *depends upon a nice Point of Chronology, which at beſt is doubtful, and amounts to no more than a probability, and is not capable of a Demonſtration. This leaves the Foundations of Epiſcopacy doubtful and uncertain.*

But our Proof that the Government of the Church of Epheſus *was ſettled in the Elders of that Church, is grounded upon plain matter of Fact, that cannot be deny'd.*

It's certain that the Apoſtle had no proſpect of ſeeing the Epheſian *Elders any more, when he*

committed the Government of that Church to them, Acts 20. 25, 28. *and therefore the Elders of* Ephesus *succeeded the Apostle in the Government of that Church.*

But it is not certain that the Apostle made Timothy *Supream Governour of that Church afterwards. Most Chronologers, the Defenders of Episcopacy not excepted, are of Opinion, That the First Epistle to* Timothy *was written before the Congress at* Miletus, *mention'd in* Acts 20. 17. *whence it naturally follows, that his Charge in* Ephesus *was occasional and temporary, as an* unfixed Evangelist, 2 Tim. 4. 5. *and the Government of that Church was left in the Elders of it,* Acts 20.17,28. *as the Supream and Perpetual Governours of it after the Apostle* Paul.

It seemeth no small disparagement to the Diocesan *Cause, that the grand Patrons of it so extreamly differ among themselves, and cannot agree about the Foundations of it.*

The Popish *Writers, Jesuits and others, do generally affirm, That Bishops were settled betimes by the Apostles in all Churches, and that though the Names of Bishops and Presbyters were common, the Offices were distinct.*

The old Protestant *Writers confess, That God hath prescribed no one Form of Church-Government in the New Testament, so* Whitgift *in Dr.* Stillingfleet's Iren. *and* Hooker's Eccl. Polit. Lib. III. *and if no Form be commanded, therefore not the Prelatical.*

Others, both Papists *and* Protestants *do say,* That

That the Presbyters mention'd in the New Teſtament, were Biſhops in a proper Senſe, thus Petavius *and* Hammond, *but with this difference*; Petavius *thinks* there were many Biſhops in one Church, *as in* Epheſus, *and that the ſimple manners of the Church would then bear this, till Ambition had corrupted Men. Dr.* Hammond *conceives there was but* one Biſhop in one Church. *This Notion of Biſhops without Subject Elders was begun by* Scotus, *as* Fr. a Sancta Clara *intimateth.*

Some late Writers acknowledge, That Biſhops and Presbyters were the ſame at firſt, but that the Apoſtles, towards the latter end of their Days, appointed the new Order of Superiour Biſhops. Biſhop Pearſon, *Dr.* Beveridge, *and others go this way. The former* Hypotheſis *makes all the* Presbyters *mention'd in the New Teſtament to be* real Biſhops, *and this makes all the* Biſhops *mention'd there to be* meer Presbyters, *and pretends that* Dioceſan Biſhops *were ſettled afterwards.*

Our Author eſpouſes this laſt Opinion, and pleads for it in his looſe and confuſed way.

This Hypotheſis *is no leſs precarious than the former, and receives very little Confirmation from the Author of* Tentamen Novum.

It were much more honourable, and ſafer for the Defenders of Epiſcopacy, *to fix it on the beſt Foundation it hath, to wit, the Laws of the Land, by which the* firſt Reformers *profeſſedly held it. It was the expreſs Doctrine*

of the Old Church of England, *before Bishop* Laud's *time, That Bishops, as Superiour to Presbyters, are an* appointment of the Civil Magistrate, *as* J. O. *hath prov'd in his Plea,* p. 113, 114.

This is agreeable to the Laws of the Land, which acknowledge nothing by Divine Right *in a Bishop, but his being a Presbyter.*

37. Hen. VIII. Cap. 17. *It is Enacted and Declared,* That Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Arch-Deacons, and other Ecclesiastical Persons, have no manner of Jurisdiction Ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from his Royal Majesty —— the Supream Head of the Church of *England* and *Ireland*, to whom by Holy Scriptures all Authority and Power is wholly given, to hear and determine all manner of Causes Ecclesiastical.

The same is declared in an Act of Parliament made 1 Edw. VI. Cap. 2. *in these Words:* All Authority of Jurisdiction, Spiritual and Temporal, is derived and deduced from the King's Majesty, as Supream Head of these Churches and Realms of *England* and *Ireland. See Cook's* Rep. de Jure Reg. Eccl. Fol. 8.

The Institution of a Christian Man, *Printed in the Year* 1543. *and allow'd by both Houses of Parliament, mentions two Orders only, viz.* Priests *and* Deacons, *as of Divine Right.*

3. *In the Third Chapter the Rector attempts to prove, That the first Epistle to* Timothy

was

was written after Paul's *first Bonds at* Rome, *and consequently after the Meeting at* Miletus, Acts 20. 17. *In my Animadversions on this Chapter, I have Vindicated the* Ancient Chronologers, *and prov'd by several Arguments, That that Epistle was written before the Meeting at* Miletus, *and by necessary consequence, the Government of the Church of* Ephesus *was in the Presbytery after the writing of that Epistle, on which* Timothy's *supposed Episcopal Power is grounded. I do not pretend that my Arguments are Demonstrations (as he calls his for the contrary Opinion) but they carry with them the greatest probability, That that Epistle was written earlier than the Rector pretends, whose Arguments I have evinced to be weak and fallacious. Tho' if it were written after, it doth not prejudice my Argument from* Acts 20.

4. *In the Fourth Chapter he pretends to prove, That Evangelists were fixed Church-Governours, that is, Bishops. His main Argument, by which he would Establish this fancy, is a begging of the Question; he takes it for granted, that* Timothy *was a* fixed Evangelist *at* Ephesus, *and* Titus *at* Crete. *That they were Evangelists he cannot deny; that they were* unfixed, *I have prov'd, in my Remarks on this Chapter. I have prov'd* Philip *also to be no fixed Evangelist, and vindicated* Eusebius *and* Chrysostom.

5. *In the Fifth Chapter he makes a flourish as if he would answer* J. O's Plea, *but leaves the*

greateſt Part untouched, and anſwers only the three firſt Arguments, and that very ſlatterinly.

Thus you have a ſhort Idea of his Book, in which he diſcovers little *of Argument,* leſs *of Reading, and* nothing *of Candor. Tedious Digreſſions, Nauſeous Repetitions, and Scornful Reflections on* J. O. *and the Diſſenters, make up very near one Third of his Book. The Truth of this will appear to any intelligent and impartial Reader.*

I ſhould not have thought it worth while to have Anſwer'd it, but for the clamorous Confidence of ſome weak People, who reckon a Book unanſwerable, when no Reply is made unto it.

His Preface being large, I muſt conſider the main parts of it in a diſtinct Chapter, and in the following Chapters ſhall Examine the ſeveral Chapters of his Book, ſo as my ſecond will anſwer to his firſt, and my third to his ſecond, and ſo of the reſt.

He muſt pardon me, if I be more juſt to him, than he has been to the Author of the Plea, and if I follow him Paragraph by Paragraph, in all that is material, and may ſeem worth Anſwering throughout his Book: For I judge it below a Scholar, and a Man of Ingenuity, to pick quarrels with a few Paſſages here and there, in a Book, and leave the greateſt Part unanſwer'd, as he hath done by

J. O.

The

THE *Reader may obſerve the Parallel between our Rector's, and Dr.* Manwaring's *Political Notions, Condemn'd in Parliament*, 4 Carol. 1628. *The Doctor's Charge drawn up by a Committee of the Commons was this.* 1. He labours to infuſe into the Conſcience of His Majeſty, the perſuaſion of a Power not bounding it ſelf with Laws, which K. *James*, of Famous Memory, calls in His Speech to the Parliament, Tyranny, yea, Tyranny accompanied with Perjury. *Ruſh. Hiſt. Collect.* Vol. 1. p. 585. Edit. 1659.

The Rector goes beyond Manwaring *in this Point, for he ſaith, That the* King's Coronation Oath is a voluntary Act of Grace, unto which the King is not obliged by the Fundamental Conſtitution: And if a Prince ſhould not give this Aſſurance, *the Rector conceives* he is not obliged to Govern ſtrictly by the preſent Law.

2. Manwaring *is charg'd*, to endeavour to perſuade the Conſcience of the Subjects, that they are bound to obey Commands illegal.

The Rector ſaith, We muſt ſupply the *Prince's* Occaſions, though Five Hundred Men (*i. e. a Houſe of Commons*) at once ſhould forbid us, *and to this* we are bound in Conſcience, *though the Prince ſhould happen to be an* Uſurper *and a* Tyrant.

3. *The*

3. *The third Charge againſt* Manwaring *was, That he* robs the Subjects of the Propriety of their Goods.

The Rector ſaith, We muſt ſupply the Prince's Occaſions, though five hundred Men ſhould forbid, becauſe our Gold and Silver bear his Image and Superſcription. *He complains that the* Rights of the People were too much ſwell'd, *and affirms,* That it is one main ground of Political Government, to deprive the Subject from being his own Judge, and Aſſerter of his own Privileges.

4. *Dr.* Manwaring brands them that will not loſe this Propriety with moſt ſcandalous Speech, and odious Titles.

The Rector is very liberal in odious Reflections on my Lord Shaftsbury, *and others, who oppoſed the Arbitrary Proceedings in the latter end of King* Charles II's. *Reign.*

5. To the ſame end, not much unlike to *Faux* and his Fellows, ſaith Mr. *R.* in the Name of the Committee, he ſeeks to blow up Parliaments, and Parliamentary Powers.

The Rector ſaith, The Prince, in effect, is the ſole Sovereign Power, if he pleaſes to Uſurp and Exerciſe it.

You ſee the Rector Confirms all Dr. Manwaring's *Poſitions, and adds ſome groſſer ones of his own, eſpecially that the* King's Coronation Oath is a voluntary Act of Grace, to which he is not obliged.

This puts me in mind of the Words of a worthy Patriot, ſpoken in Parliament, March 22. 1627. *upon occaſion of* Sibthorp *and* Manwaring's *Sermons.* * It is well known, *ſaith he*, the People of this State are under no other Subjection than what they did voluntarily conſent to, by the *Original Contract* between King and People; and as there are many Prerogatives and Priviledges conferr'd on the King, ſo there are left to the Subject many neceſſary Liberties and Priviledges, as appears by the common Laws and Acts of Parliaments, notwithſtanding what theſe two || *Sycophants* have prated in the Pulpit to the contrary.

* *Ruſh. Ibid.* P. 503.

Sibthorp and Manwaring.

The Commons form'd the Charge againſt Dr. Manwaring *into a Declaration, which being Ingroſs'd and Read, was ſent to the Lords for their Concurrence. Mr.* Pym's *Learned Speech at the delivery of the Charge before the Lords, is well worth the reading.* Ruſh. ubi ſupr. p. 595——604.

Not long after the Commons proceeded to give Judgment againſt Dr. Manwaring. 1. To be Impriſoned during the Pleaſure of the Houſe. 2. To be Fined 1000 *l.* to the King. 3. To make ſuch a Submiſſion as the Houſe ſhall preſcribe. 4. To be Suſpended from his Miniſtry three Years. 5. To be diſabled to have any Eccleſiaſtical Dignity, or Secular Office. 6. To be diſabled to Preach at Court hereafter. 7. That his ſaid Book

is

is worthy to be Burnt, and that His Majesty may be mov'd to grant a Proclamation to call in the said Books, that they may be all burnt in *London*, and both Universities. *Rush. Ibid.* p. 605.

* *Church Hist. Lib.* XI. p. 130. *Mr.* Fuller * *saith, That much of this Censure was remitted, upon his humble Submission at both the Bars in Parliament, the Form of which you have in him, and in Mr.* Rushworth.

‖ *Rush. Ibid.* p. 633. *But the King Issued out His Proclamation for the total Suppressing of the Sermons* ‖.

I mention these things not to expose the Rector, who is secured by several Acts of Grace *pass'd since the Publishing of those Sermons, but to expose his dangerous Doctrine, that overturns the Foundations of our excellent Government.*

THE

THE

Contents of the Chapters.

CHAP. I.

THE *Diſſenters* Vindicated in their way of managing Controverſies. *Calvin* Vindicated. Biſhops Lordly Titles conſider'd. The Parallel between the Canons in *Acts* 15. and the *Engliſh* Canons. Pariſh-Miniſters have no Power of Diſcipline. The *Waldenſes* had no Superiour Biſhops, proved, 1. From their Doctrine, That Biſhops and Presbyters are the ſame. 2. From their own Teſtimony. 3. The Teſtimony of F. *Paul.* 4. By ſeveral Inſtances of Ordination by their Presbyters in *England*, before the Reformation. Of the uninterrupted Succeſſion of Biſhops. *P.* 1 *to* 45.

Chap. II. Whether the *Jewiſh* Church was the Firſt Eſtabliſhed Church. The Levitical Prieſt-hood no Pattern for Goſpel-Miniſters. *Clemens Rom.* Vindicated. Whether Jeſus Chriſt modelled His Church after the *Jewiſh* Pattern, or left His Church in a State of Oligarchy, as our Author ſaith. His

His firſt Inſtance of Ordination, from *Acts* 1. Conſider'd. 2. The Ordination of the Seven Deacons: They were Miniſters of Tables, not of the Word and Sacraments, prov'd from Scripture and Antiquity. Objections Anſwer'd. 3. His third Inſtance of Ordination, from *Acts* 9. 17. conſider'd. 4. His Fourth from *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. This Inſtance of Ordination by Presbyters Vindicated. The difference berween Apoſtles and Prophets, as ſtated by him, conſider'd. 5. His fifth Inſtance from *Acts* 14. 23. Examined. 6. *Acts* 19. 6, 7. conſider'd. 7. 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. Vindicated. 8. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. for Ordination by Presbyters, Vindicated. Dr. *Owen* Defended. The Rector unſound in the Doctrine of Juſtification. 9. 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. Vindicated. *P.* 45. *to* 99.

Chap. III. The Apoſtle left the Government of *Epheſus* in the Presbyters. This Eſtabliſhment prov'd to be his *laſt*, Divine, Perpetual. *Acts* 20. Explain'd. This Government never alter'd Presbyters a Divine Remedy againſt Schiſm. Superiour Biſhops not the Remedy. *Timothy* no Dioceſan Biſhop. An unfix'd Evangeliſt. Of the *Aſian* Angels, not ſo call'd from the Provincial Guardian Angels. *Ignatius* his Biſhop, not Dioceſan. *Titus* no Dioceſan Biſhop. Presbyters are Rulers. *P.* 99. *to p.* 121.

Chap. IV. The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written before *Paul*'s Impriſonment at *Rome*.

Ac-

Acknowledged by the Ancients, and by the Learned Aſſerters of Epiſcopacy, Bp. *Hall*, Dr. *Hammond*, *&c.* deny'd by the *Rhemiſts*, Bp. *Pearſon*, *&c.* *Paul*'s Journey to *Macedonia*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. conſider'd. *Jerom* Vindicated. Reaſons to prove that the Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written before *Paul*'s firſt Bonds. The ſecond Epiſtle written in his firſt Bonds. An Objection Anſwer'd. *Acts* 20. 25. Conſider'd. *P.* 121. *to p.* 141.

Chap. V. Of Evangeliſts, whether they were fixed? *Neg.* *Acts* 21. 8. conſider'd. *Timothy* and *Titus* unfixed. *Hilarius* his Account of Evangeliſts. *Euſebius*'s Teſtimony Vindicated. *Mark* no fixed Evangeliſt. *Chryſoſtom*'s Account of Evangeliſts, agreeing with *Euſebius*. *P.* 141. *to p.* 151.

Chap. VI. Of Pariſh-Diſcipline. Presbyters have Power of Government. 1. *J. O*'s firſt Argument for Ordination by Presbyters, *viz.* the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters acknowledged. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. conſider'd. 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. doth not prove *Timothy* Bp. of *Epheſus*. Dr. *Whittaker* Vindicated. *Ignatius*'s One Altar explain'd. The extent of the Church of *Epheſus*. An Objection Anſwer'd. *Rev.* 5. 11. Vindicated. Dr. *Lightfoot*'s Notion of Angel Vindicated. 2. *J. O*'s ſecond Argument for Ordination by Presbyters, and third Argument Vindicated. Presbyters ſucceeded the Apoſtles. *Ignatius* and *Ireneus* Vindicated. More Teſtimonies to the ſame effect. *P.* 151. *to p.* 190.

E R-

ERRATA.

PAge 11. Marg. after 80. read 1. P. 12. M. for 1235. r. 1245. P. 14. M. for 5. 30. r. 530. P. 26. M. f. P. 14. r. p. 13, 14. P. 35. l. 25. r. *Pope's Casualties*. P. 46, l. 20. f. 24. r. 26. P. 53. l. 22. f. 72. r. 73. P. 63. M. f. *clerios* r. *clericis*. P. 67. l. 13. *dele* a. l. 15, r. *resolved*. P. 87. l. 6. r. *Sanhedrin*. P. 89. l. 11. f. *of* r. *at*. p. 100. l. 10. f. 18. r. 28. p. 104. l. 3. r. *story*. p. 106. l. 31. r. *Presbyters*. p. 109. l. 38. r. *Mal*. 2. 1. 7. p. 111. l. 38. r. *Diocess*. p. 120. l. 7. r. 2 *Cor*. 2. 12, 13. p. 122. l. 15. r. *Concession*. p. 140. l. 13. r. *ye*. p. 143. l. 13. r. *Cretensis*. p. 148. l. 3. 15. r. *πανταχȣ̃* & l. 30. p. 149. l. 15. r. *περῆόντων*, p. 151. l. 22. r. *Crambe*. p. 153. l. 8. r. *there*. p. 157. l. 12. r. *Apostle*. p. 160. l. 2. f. 22. r. 2. 2. l. *ult*. r. *an*. p. 172. l. 36. f. *dot*. r. *not*. p. 175. l. 8. r. *Conduct*.

A Defence of Scripture-Ordination, &c.

CHAP. I.

The Diſſenters *Juſtified in their Way of Managing Controverſies.* Calvin *Vindicated. Biſhops Lordly Titles Conſidered. The Parallel between the Canons in* Acts 15. *and the* Engliſh *Canons. Pariſh-Miniſters have no power of Diſcipline. The* Waldenſes *had no Superiour Biſhops, prov'd,* 1. *From their Doctrine*; 2. *From their own Teſtimony*; 3. *From* F. Paul's *Teſtimony*; 4. *By ſeveral Inſtances of Ordination by their Presbyters in* England, *before the Reformation. Of the uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Biſhops.*

BEFORE he enters upon his Subject, he deſires *his common Reader to obſerve the unfair way the* Diſſenters *have in managing Controverſies.* *Pref.* p. 2.

1. Do they pick up imperfect Notes of Sermons Preached a Year or two before,

and take upon them to Confute them, when the Authors are dead, and cannot Vindicate themſelves? This were a little *unfair*; but he knows who did ſo, when he Preached his Sermon of *Conſecration*, in Anſwer to a Sermon of Mr. *Baldwin*, under the Fictitious Name of *Calvin*, (as I am told) becauſe, forſooth, *Calvus* is *Bald*, and *Vin* is *Wine*, and ſo you have the *Engliſh* of *Calvin*, q; *Bald-wine*; Doubtleſs ſo Learned an *Etymologiſt* can give a Reaſon why the odd Epithet of *Bald* is attributed to *Wine*. I am apt to think *Calvin* himſelf, as Learned as he was, never thought of this rare *Etymon* of his Name. But to return to our Subject;

2. Do the *Diſſenters* uſe to lodge their *Manuſcripts* in ſome Friend's hand, with a charge that none ſhall ſee them, except they undertake to Anſwer them, and promiſe to return them the ſame Day? This is *an unfair way of managing Controverſies*, and it is much *more unfair* for a Man to triumph that a *Manuſcript* clog'd with ſuch unreaſonable Conditions is not Anſwer'd. The *Rector* can Name the *unfair Man* that hath thus managed the Controverſie of the *Conſecration-Sermon*, mention'd before.

3. Or do the *Diſſenters* pretend to Anſwer Books, and leave the greateſt part of them unanſwered? He knows who does ſo alſo, and Inſinuates in his *Title Page*, as if he had Anſwered the Whole, when indeed

deed it is far otherwiſe. This is *an unfair way of managing Controverſies*, which ſomebody is guilty of.

But let's hear how he proves his Charge.

I. *In moſt of their Books, be the Argument what it will, they repreſent us as Arminians*, Pref. ſaith he.

Perſons that have a ſore place complain they are hurt, if one do but touch them. This Charge of *Arminianiſm* is either true, or falſe; if true, confeſs it, and give glory to God; if falſe, diſprove it. I doubt the *Rector* cannot acquit himſelf, whatever others do; for I ſee not why he ſhould mention it here, except it were to vent his Spleen againſt poor *Calvin*, not the Engliſh *Calvin* (alias *Baldwin*) but the *French* Miniſter of that Name, upon whom he paſſeth this Cenſure;

I am perſuaded, if the moſt underſtanding Page 3. *Calviniſt would repreſent the Opinions of that great Man in their true Colours, he would fright more out of their Wits, than he could ſolidly ſatisfie, or Proſelyte to his Party.*

If I ſhould attempt to repreſent the Opinions of *Calvin* in their true Colours, I deſpair *of ſatisfying* a Man of Mr. *G*'s. Kidney; nor would I be ſo ſpiteful, *as to fright him out of his Wits:* However, I hope I may, without prejudice to his Intellect, refer him to the Seventeenth Article of the Church of *England*, concerning Predeſtination and Election, and to the Prayer at Burials,

rials, That God would *ſhortly accompliſh the number of his Elect*, which aſſert one of *Calvin*'s moſt frightful Doctrines, namely, that of *Election*, which implies *Reprobation*, or *Preterition*. To *chooſe*, is to Select ſome from among others that are *left*.

I preſume he hath declared his *Aſſent* and *Conſent* to the Articles and Liturgy, with what Sincerity he knows beſt: Perhaps his pre-conceived Notions have given ſuch a Tincture to his Eyes, as happily ſecures him from the *Intellectual danger* of ſeeing ſome *Truths in their own Colours*.

Ibid. *He wonders with what Confidence the little Striplings which Mr.* Frankl. *Inſtructs, ſo ſoon as they have Commenced, he knows not what Degree, are ready to determine the Cauſe between* Arminius *and* Calvin, *as if they were Doctors of the Chair.*

I am afraid our *Rector* is no great Philoſopher; for a Philoſopher, who inquires into the Reaſons of things, wonders at nothing; but,

1. Why ſhould he wonder that Mr. *Fr.*'s Pupils ſhould with the ſame freedom determine for *Calvin*, that many raw Youths that come from the *Univerſities* do for his beloved *Arminius?* Can that be a *Crime* in ours, which paſſes for a *Vertue* in theirs?

2. To cure his wonder, I will tell him the Reaſon why they determine againſt *Arminius*, becauſe *Judicious* and *Learned* Mr. *Fr.* who as little *needs* my *Commendation*, as he

he *fears* the Rector's *Cenſure*, directs his Pupils to the Study of the Scriptures, and their own Hearts, which will enable them betimes to exalt the *Free Grace* of God, and to depreſs the proud and *enſlaved Will* of Man.

3. One that is a Genuine Son of the Church, will not wonder that Mr. *Fr.* ſhould acquaint his Scholars with the *Orthodox Ancient Doctrine* of the *Church of* England, whoſe Learned Divines Subſcribed the Decrees of the *Calviniſtical Synod of* Dort, in Conformity to the Doctrine of the *Engliſh* Church, which preferred them after their return, and never Cenſured that Act of theirs.

The Senſe of the Church of *England* may be ſeen in her Articles, whereof the *Tenth* is againſt *Free-Will*, the *Thirteenth* againſt *Works preparatory to Grace*, and the *Seventeenth* for *Predeſtination and Election.* The Articles were Compoſed, *A. D.* 1562. Some Years after, *viz. A.* 1595. the *Lambeth Articles* came out, which were drawn up by Arch-Biſhop *Whitgift*, with the Advice of ſeveral of his Clergy, and Subſcribed by the Arch-Biſhop of *York*, and afterwards Inſerted into the Articles of the Church of *Ireland* Theſe agree with that Determination of the Synod of *Dort*.*

Why may not Mr *Fr.* ſcholars as well Determine for the Doctrine contain'd in the Articles of the Church of *England*,

* *Fuller's Eccl. Hiſt.* lib. IX. p. 230.

which they Sincerely and Honeſtly Subſcribe, as Mr. *G.* and his Friends do determine againſt the Doctrine of the Church, under the odious Name of *Calviniſm?* Who yet make ſhift to Subſcribe her Articles, by the help of a *ſorry diſtinction*, that they Subſcribe them not as *Articles of Faith*, but as *Articles of Peace*; a Diſtinction that may help a Man to ſwallow the *Maſs* or the *Alcoran*, when his Peace and Temporal Advantages require it. Mr. *Fr*'s. *little Striplings*, (as he calls them) Thanks be to God, are better *inſtructed*.

4. As to *Scholaſtical Degrees*, they are *Ornamental Titles* of no great Antiquity in the *Chriſtian* World, invented in the *Lateran* Council, *Ann. Dom.* 1215. A wiſe Man values Perſons by their real Worth, and not by empty Titles, which are moſt coveted by ſuch as are leaſt worthy of them; and ſince the new Conformity, clog'd with ſuch Conditions, as the *Diſſenters* cannot comply with. For the ſame Reaſon the *Waldenſes* and *Bohemians* rejected Popiſh Degrees, nor would *Bucer* accept of a Doctor's Degree in *Cambridge*, until the offenſive initiating Ceremonies were diſpenſed with.

Gentil. exam. Con. Trid. p. 6.

Hoorn. ſum Contr. l. 10 p. 754.

Degrees were freely given to all deſerving Perſons, before the Year 1616. when Subſcription began to be urged, by the Intereſt of Dr. *Laud*, and his Party at Court, who procur'd an Order from K. *James*, directed

directed to the Vice-Chancellor, the Heads of Colledges and Halls, *&c.* in *Oxon*, That none ſhould take any Degrees, without Subſcribing the III. *Articles* in the XXXVI. *Canon*. *Cambridge*, not long after, ſubmitted to the ſame Innovation. For Mr. *Hilderſam* Commenced Batchelor, and Maſter of Arts, without any Subſcription: But about 1617. one Mr. *Smith*, Miniſter of *Clavering* in *Eſſex*, deſiring to Commence Doctor, it was impoſed to put him by, and ſo upon all Doctors and Batchelors in Divinity, by Letters from the King. It was afterward Impoſed alſo upon Maſters of Art and Batchelors.

Laud's *life* by *Dr* Heylin, *p.* 71, 72.

II. *Another common Topick*, as our Author tells us, *Is to repreſent the Biſhops, proud and haughty Perſons, and chiefly, becauſe of the Honourable Title of Lord given them, which is more excuſable, than for every Preacher to aſſume the Title of Maſter: For the Law hath beſtowed that Title upon the Biſhops, but not that of Maſter upon all Preachers.*

Pref. p. 4.

This is a general Charge, and not prov'd. I am ſure *J. O.* doth not Charge them with being *Proud* and *Haughty*. 'Tis true, ſome grave *Diſſenters*, and ſober Church-Men alſo, have expreſſed their wiſhes, that the Biſhops would diveſt themſelves of their Honourable Titles, and Secular Grandeur, for theſe Reaſons, among others.

1. Becauſe the Holy Apoſtles, whoſe Succeſſors, they ſay, they are, aſſumed to themſelves

ſelves no ſuch Titles. We no where read of My *Lord Peter*, My *Lord Paul*. The Apoſtles little dreamt, that a ſort of Men ſhould ſucceed them, that would look more like the Princes of the Earth, than the plain and mortified Miniſters of the *Humble Jeſus*.

2. Lordly Titles, and Spiritual Domination, ſeem to be forbidden by the *Great Lord* of the Church, *Mat.* 20. 25, 26. *The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe dominion over them; and they that are great, exerciſe authority upon them, but it ſhall not be ſo among you.*

That which diſtinguiſheth Civil Magiſtrates from Goſpel Miniſters, is the *Exerciſe of Dominion*, and *Titles of Honour*; both theſe are forbidden unto Miniſters. *It ſhall not be ſo among you.* You muſt not Exerciſe Lordſhip, and Dominion over your Flocks and Brethren in the Miniſtry. The *Papiſts*, and ſome others object, That *Tyrannical*, and not *Lawful Dominion*, is here forbidden. And therefore, ſay they, *Matthew* uſeth the Words κατακυριεύσιν, and κατεξουσιάζουσιν, which ſignifie *Arbitrary and Tyrannical Dominion.*

Bellarm. de Rom. Pon. V. 10.

But it will appear, that our Saviour forbids all Dominion, as well as Tyranny, if we conſider,

1. That St. *Luke* uſeth the Simple Verbs κυριεύσιν, and ἐξουσιάζειν, *Luke* 22. 25. which ſignifie Lawful, and not Tyrannical Dominion. And St. *Matthew* ought to be interpreted by *Luke*, becauſe the Apoſtle,

ſtle, ſpeaking of *Spiritual Dominion*, uſeth the ſimple Verb κυριεύειν, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. οὐκ ὅτι κυριεύομεν, *Not that we have dominion over your Faith.* The Apoſtles did not exerciſe any Dominion over the Conſciences of Men; they reckon'd themſelves *Miniſters*, not *Lords.* They had the power of the *Word*, and not of the *Sword.* Their Weapons were not Carnal, but Spiritual; κατακυριεύειν ſignifies *Lawful Dominion.* *Adam*'s Dominion over the Creatures, in a State of Innocency, which was far from Tyranny, is expreſſed by κατακυριεύειν, in the LXX. *Gen.* 1. 28. κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς. Chriſt's Dominion, which is moſt Holy and Righteous, and infinitely remote from Tyranny, is ſet forth by the ſame Word, *Pſal.* 110. 2. κατακυρίευε ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου, *rule thou in the midſt of thine enemies.*

2. Chriſt forbids that Dominion which the Apoſtles coveted, and were ambitious of. What was that? Not a Tyrannical Power over their Brethren, far be it from us to impute ſuch horrid wickedneſs to ſuch good Men; they were not ſo wicked as to deſire an abſolute Power to Tyrannize over the Conſciences and Bodies of their Fellow-Subjects: The Strife among them was, *which of them ſhould be accounted the greateſt*, Luke 22. 24. They expected to be ſo many Princes, dignified with *Power*, and *Titles of Honour* above others. They dreamt of a Temporal Kingdom the *Meſſiah* was to ſet up

up, as moſt of the *Jewiſh* Nation did, and were Ambitious of the Chiefeſt Dignities in this Kingdom, *Mat.* 20. 21. They thought Jeſus Chriſt would ſet up for a *Temporal Prince*, and they aſpire to a *Temporal Dominion*. He tells them, That *Dominion* belongs to *Temporal Princes*, but it muſt not be ſo among his Miniſters.

It ill becomes *Servants* to aſſume the form of *Princes*, when their *Great Prince* aſſum'd the *form of a Servant*, Mat. 20. 27, 28. *Whoſoever will be chief---- let him be your ſervant, even as the Son of Man came not to be Miniſtred unto, but to Miniſter.*

3. It was not a Tyrannical Dominion they Coveted, for the Dominion they deſired was in Subordination to Jeſus Chriſt, as their Prince and King, under whom they deſired to be *Chief Miniſters of State*, next unto Jeſus Chriſt in Power and Dominion. *One would ſit on his right hand, another at his left, in his Kingdom*, Mat. 20. 21. Now the Power which they deſir'd, being in Subordination to Jeſus Chriſt, as Lord and King, cannot be a Tyrannical Power, for this were to impute Tyranny to Chriſt Himſelf, which were Blaſphemy.

It cannot therefore be imagined, That Chriſt ſhould forbid Tyrannical Dominion here, which they had no thoughts of. Therefore all Dominion, like that of the Princes of the Earth, which conſiſts in a Coercive Power, worldly Grandeur, and ſwelling Titles of Honour, is here forbidden. 3.

3. The *Dissenters* are not the only Persons who have opposed the Secular Dominion, and Lordly Titles of Bishops.

In the Primitive Church they were forbidden to intermeddle with Secular Affairs, which are the Province of Civil Magistrates, upon pain of Deprivation.

The Ancient *Canons*, call'd the *Apostles*, which are Confirm'd by the Sixth General Council, at *Constantinople*, do depose all Bishops that engage themselves in *Publick Administrations*, and *Worldly Cares*.

Can. 2. *Can. Apost.* 6. *al.* 7. & 80.

They are forbidden to receive Secular Honours, by the great Council of *Chalcedon*, Can. 7. μήτε ἐπὶ ἀξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι.

Sæcularia officia negotiaq; abjiciant: Honorum gradus per ambitionem non subeant. Conc. Mogunt. Can. 10.

In the Council of *Mentz*, which was called by *Charles* the Great, *A. D.* 813. The Clergy are enjoyned to *abstain from Secular Offices and Affairs, and from an ambitious Assuming of Degrees of Honour.*

Semel in clero deputati, nec ad militiam, neq; ad aliquam veniam dignitatem mundanam.

I find another *German* Council about the Year 895. making the Clergy incapable of Secular Dignities.

Conc. Tribur. Can. 27. The Canon refers to the Decree of the General Council at *Chalcedon*, *Can.* 7. and pronounces an *Anathema* against those that violate this Determination, as the Council of *Chalcedon* had done before.

Quasi bruta animalia, libertate ac desiderio suo ferun-

The Canon adds, That *Isidore* compares those Clergy-Men, who are for Secular Affairs and Dignities, to *Hippocentaurs*, who are neither Horses nor Men, but are acted by a brutal Appetite.

Jerom tur.

Meminerint Episcopi, se sacerdotes esse, non dominos. Hie. ad Nepot.

Jerom desires the Bishops to remember, That they are *Priests*, not *Lords*.

**De Civ. Dei* XIX. 19.

Austin saith, *Episcopacy is a name of work, and not of honour* *.

Conc. Constant. VIII. Can. 14.

Valentinian made a Law, recalling the Judicial Power of Bishops in all Causes, except those of Faith and Religion, unless voluntarily chosen by the contending Parties: Yet they grasp'd all Power into their Hands, until at last they were able to Cope with Kings and Princes, and Emperours must acknowledge them for their Equals.

This made them a common Grievance to the Princes of *Europe*, insomuch that *Frederick* the second Emperour, about the Year 1245. attempted to reduce them to the Primitive Simplicity, as appears by a Letter which he wrote to the *King of* England, and to the *King of* France, and to many other Princes, in the close of which he signifies his Intention *to divest the Universal Church of it's Nobility and Dignity, and to reduce the Church to its Primitive Poverty and Humility.*

Nobilitatem & Dignitatem Universalis Ecclesiæ annullare. M. West. *ad* A. D. 1235. P. 293.

It cannot be imagined, that he design'd to deprive Bishops of a necessary and just Maintenance, but of their excessive and superfluous Wealth, and of their lordly Dignities. But the Time was not yet come, the Ecclesiastical was too hard for the Temporal Power, the Emperour was at last deposed by Pope *Innocent* IVth, and his Council

cil of Biſhops at *Lyons*, and at laſt deſtroy'd by *Manfred*, his Natural or rather Unnatural Son.

In the Year of Chriſt, 1247. many of the Nobility of *France* enter into a Confederacy, confirm'd by a ſolemn Oath, to reduce the Clergy to the Primitive Simplicity. They Publiſhed an Inſtrument, ſignifying, "That the Clergy had ſwallow'd "up the Juriſdiction of ſecular Princes, "and that the Sons of Slaves, or Servants, "did judge Free-Men according to their "own Laws, who ought to have been "judg'd by the Nobles. They put us in a "worſe Condition (ſay the Confederate "Nobles) then God would have the *Pa-"gans* to be in, when he ſaid, *Render to "Cæſar the things that are Cæſars, and to "God the things that are Gods.* We De-"cree and Enact, that from henceforth no "Clerk, or Lay-Man bring any Cauſe be-"fore the Ordinary or his Delegate, ex-"cept it be that of Hereſie, Matrimony "or Uſury: That ſo our Juriſdiction be-"ing revived, and that they, who are en-"rich'd by our Impoveriſhment, may be "reduced to the State of the Primitive "Church. They conclude in the Words "of the Emperor's Letter, It was always "our Intention to oblige the Clergy of "every Order, eſpecially the greateſt, to "continue the ſame in the Faith, that they "were in the Primitive Church, leading

"an

M. West. *ad* An. 1247. p. 217, 218. "an Apoſtolical Life, and imitating the "Humility of the Lord Jeſus.

The Civil Dominion of the Clergy was one of the main Grievances of the *Bohemians*, which they would have redreſs'd in the Council of *Baſil.* Their Delegates Diſputed fifty Days upon this, and three other Articles in the Council.

Fox's *Acts and Mon. ad* An. 1438.

The Lordly Titles and Dominion of the Clergy were very offenſive to ſeveral Confeſſors, and Martyrs in this Kingdom before the Reformation.

That eminent Light of his Age *Jo. Wickliff* affirm'd, that it was a Mortal Sin for a Clergy-Man to exerciſe Civil Dominion.

Non ſtat purè Clericum abſque Mortali peccato civiliter dominari.

My Lord *Cobham* calls the Poſſeſſions and Lordſhips of Biſhops the *Venom* of the Church.

Walſ. Hiſt. p. 208.

Swinderby, a learned Confeſſor (and Martyr, as Mr. *Fox* thinks) hath theſe Words. *If Men ſpeaken of worldly Power, and Lordſhips, and Worſhips, with other Vices that reignen therein, what Prieſt that deſires, and has moſt hereof (in what Degree ſoever he be) he is moſt* Antichriſt *of all the Prieſts that ben on Earth.*

Fox ad Ann. Do. 1413.

John Purvey, a Learned Writer againſt Popery, whom *Thomas Walden* calls the *Library of Lollards* and *Gloſer* upon *Wickliff*, ſaith, *It is a great Abomination that Biſhops, Monks and other Prelates, be ſo great Lords in this World, whereas Chriſt with his Apoſtles and Diſciples never took upon them ſecular Dominion*

Fox ad A. D. 1390.

Ibid. p. 530. *Edit* 1576.

He

He adds, *That all Christians ought to the utmost of their Power and Strength to swear that they will reduce such shavelings to the Humility and Poverty of Christ and his Apostles.*

William Tindal, that famous Instrument of Reformation, who was burnt in *Flanders* by the Instigation of the *English* Monks, because he had translated the Scriptures to the *English* Tongue, writes, *That it was a shame of all shames, and a monstrous thing that Bishops should deal in Civil Causes.* See his Works, *p.* 124. and in *p.* 140. *What Names have they?* My Lord *Bishop*, my Lord *Arch-Bishop*, *if it please your* Lordship, *if it please your* Grace *!*

The brightness of this Truth hath shined upon some Doctors of the *Roman* Church in the darkest Times.

Ocham wrote against the temporal Dominion of the Pope and Prelates, as *Nauclerus* tells us. Gen. 45. *ad* An. Dom. 1338.

One of the *Cardinals* in the Council of *Basil* in a warm Speech for *Amedeus*, *Duke of* Savoy, Candidate for the Popedom, hath these Words. *I have often consented unto their Opinion, which said it was expedient that the Temporal Dominions should be divided from the Ecclesiastical Estate; For I did think, that the Priests should thereby be made more apt to the Divine Ministry.* *Ad nihilum deducens potestatem Papæ & Prælatorum in temporali Dominio.* *Acts and Mon.* p. 667.

The *Roman Pagan* Priests medled not in Civil Affairs, because if they had, they must of Necessity either ἀσεβεῖν τοὺς θεοὺς, *neglect*

left the Worſhip of the Gods, or βλάπτειν τὰς πολιτείας, prejudice the Citizens, by omitting the Duties owing to the one or the other, which would often interfere. The very Light of Nature, taught the *Heathen* that the Service of the Gods, and Attendance upon ſecular Imployments were inconſiſtent. For this Reaſon, the Apoſtle forbids the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, eſpecially Biſhops, *To entangle themſelves with the Affairs of this Life*, 2 Tim. 2. 3, 4.

Plut. Queſt. Rom. ult.

I will conclude this Head with a Paſſage or two out of *Mounſ. Jurieu's Paſtoral Letters* to the perſecuted *French Proteſtants*.

Paſt. Let. 1. p. 4, 5.

In his firſt *Paſtoral Letter*, he thus animadverts upon *The Paſtoral Letter of my Lord the Biſhop of* Meaux. "Theſe Gentle-"men are well advanc'd, ſince the Au-"thors and Founders of Chriſtianity, who "call'd themſelves plainly by their own "Names, without any other Title than "that of Servants of Jeſus Chriſt, and "Apoſtles of our Lord. *My Lord's* St. "*Peter*, and St. *Paul* had forgotten to ſet "the Character of their Grandeur on the "Front of their Paſtoral Letters or Epi-"ſtles. 'Tis not very Edifying to ſee the "marks of Pride and worldly Vanity on "the front of a Paſtoral Letter.

He adds a little after, *Do not ſuffer your ſelves to be abuſed by thoſe that tell you, that in ſome Proteſtants States, the Biſhops retain the*

the ſame Honours. The Biſhops of England *have this to ſay for themſelves, that they are Peers of the Realm, to which State and Condition the Name and Title of my Lord doth appertain and belong: But beſides, I am perſwaded that the wiſer of theſe Gentlemen, will willingly ſacrifice theſe Titles (which do not ſufficiently beſpeak the Humility of a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt) to a general Reformation in the Church when it ſhall be receiv'd.*

I hope by this Time, the Reader is convinced how impertinently Mr. *G. Appeals to the* Quakers, whom he calls *indifferent Perſons, and honeſt in this Caſe, becauſe they have quarrell'd, not at the Title of* Lord *only, but at that of* Maſter *alſo.* Pref. p. 4.

Jeſus Chriſt and his *Apoſtles*, the *General Council* of *Chalcedon*, the *Fathers*, *Princes*, *Confeſſors*, and *Doctors* here witneſſing againſt the Lordly Titles and Dominion of Biſhops, were no *Quakers*. *J. O.* will not contend for the Title of *Maſter*, which Mr. *G.* in Conformity to his *indifferent Quaker*, doth not think fit to give him in his whole Book.

3. *A third Way* (ſaith the Rector) *is to accuſe us of ſymbolizing with Papiſts.* I cou'd wiſh there were no occaſion for this Charge. Our Diſagreement with the Church of *England* is in thoſe things, wherein ſhe agrees with that of *Rome*, and in which both of them diſagree with the Practiſe of the Apoſtles, and the Reformed Churches abroad. p. 5.

He tells us out of *Euſeb.* Lib. 1. (it ſhould have been *Lib.* 2.) c. 16. *That* Mark *conſtituted Churches in* Alexandria, *that ſo great a Multitude both of Men and Women there embraced the Chriſtian Faith*, &c. *Theſe Churches* Mark *govern'd, and after him Biſhop* Anianus, *as is ſhew'd in theſe Papers.* This Quotation *he the rather produces, becauſe it has been over-look'd of late.*

This Paſſage is a little unluckily produced, for

1. It over-throws the Notion of the learned Aſſertors of Epiſcopacy, that *a Dioceſs is the loweſt Species of a Church*, and that particular Congregations are but Oratories, and no Churches: A Biſhop and a Church being Relatives. But *Euſebius* ſpeaks of Churches of *Alexandria*, therefore there muſt be *Biſhops of* Alexandria, not one Biſhop, and this agreeable enough to the Apoſtolical Platforms, who appointed ſeveral Biſhops in one City, *Acts* 20. 17, 28. *Phil.* 1. 1.

2. *Mark* was an *Evangeliſt*, an extraordinary unfixed Officer, *Eph.* 4. 11. 1 *Pet.* 5. 13. *Euſebius* calls him *Peter*'s *Companion*, and an Evangeliſt.

Hiſt. 11. 14. 23. *Ibid.*

3. *Anianus* ſucceeded *Mark* the Evangeliſt *in the Miniſtry of the Church of* Alexandria, not as a Biſhop of a Superior Order to the Presbyters there, but as an honourable Preſident in their Aſſemblies, ſuch a Moderator as the *Reformed Churches* have

have in their Synods and Aſſemblies, without Power of Juriſdiction over his Colleagues: And that he was no more, *J. O.* hath prov'd at large in his *Plea*, out of *Jerom* and *Eutychius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, where we have a clear Proof of Presbyters Ordaining for almoſt two hundred Years together. The Rector did not judge it adviſeable, to meddle with *J. O*'s. Remarks upon the *Church of* Alexandria. Either he had read that Chapter in *J. O*'s Book, or he had not: If he had, he is inexcuſable; if not, he ſhould read Books before he undertake to anſwer them, *Prov.* 18. 13. *He that anſwereth a Matter before he heareth* (or underſtandeth it) *it is Folly and Shame unto him.* *Cap.* 10. p. 126. 130.

4. *Moreover ſo great a Multitude* (ſaith the Rector out of *Euſeb.*) *there embraced the Faith*, &c. He ſuppreſſeth the reſt of the Sentence, which is thus, *that even* Philo *judg'd it worth while to deſcribe their way of Living.* Our Author would perſwade us by this half Sentence, that there were vaſt numbers of Converts in *Alexandria* in *Mark*'s Time, but leaves out the reſt by a Cunning, *&c.* for he knew the invalidity of *Euſeb's* Reaſon, *that* Philo *had deſcribed the Chriſtians in* Egypt, whereas the Truth is, he writes of the *Eſſenes*, and not of the *Chriſtians*, as the Learned have prov'd

This I Note only by the by, as an Inſtance of this Gentleman's *unfairneſs* in

quoting Authors, otherwiſe I am not concern'd in the numbers of the *Alexandrian Converts*, for as they increas'd there and in other Places, they multiplied into more Churches, who had *Paſtors* aſſign'd them, with Power of Diſcipline over their reſpective Flocks.

In ſhort, the inſtance of the *Alexandrian Biſhop* makes altogether for us, for he was but the chief Presbyter (as an Arch-Deacon was the chief Deacon) choſen and named by the Presbyters without any Conſecration, and in his room the Presbyters ordain'd another, as *J. O.* hath prov'd in his *Plea*.

Mr. *G.* in the next Place, ſhews the Parallel between their Church Goverment, and that of the Apoſtles. *Our Epiſcopal Government* (ſaith he) *is eſtabliſh'd upon certain Canons and Laws made and conſented unto by the Convocation, conſiſting of Biſhops and Presbyters, and by the Multitude of Believers, that is, their Repreſentatives in Parliament. And thus it was in the Council of* Jeruſalem, *Acts* 15.

Let's a little conſider this Paragraph,

1. I expected, he would have ſaid the Epiſcopal Government is eſtabliſhed upon the Word of God, but he ingeniouſly confeſſeth the Truth of the Matter, that it is *eſtabliſhed upon certain Canons and Laws of humane deviſing*. We conceive the Laws of Chriſt and the Canons of the Apoſtles, con-

contained in the New Teſtament, ſufficient for the Government of the Church.

2. He makes the *Multitude of Believers* in *Jeruſalem*, to be as the *Repreſentatives* of the People *in Parliament*. Many of our Learned Antiquaries have induſtriouſly laboured to ſearch into the *Original of Parliaments*, ſome conceive they owe their beginning to the *Normans*, ſome to the *Saxons*, others derive them higher, all confeſs the *Riſe* of them, like the Head of *Nilus* very obſcure; but this Gentleman by an unparallel'd Felicity of Invention, has found them in the Council at *Jeruſalem*, Acts 15. where no Body before ever dreamt of them.

However, I am glad to find him ſpeaking any thing in favour of Parliaments, for ſome Years ago, when they were out of Requeſt, he advanced the Prerogative to that Degree, that Parliaments, the Bulwarks of the Subjects Liberty, were very inſignificant things with him. I will give a few Inſtances, 1. He would exempt the Clergy from the Power of Parliaments in Point of Taxes. *We the Clergy*, ſaith he, *are hook'd in, I know not how, to Pay Taxes without the conſent of the Convocation.* 2. He will not allow the aggriev'd Subject, the benefit of *Petitioning and Addreſſing their Prince*, eſpecially *when he is under ſome diſadvantage.* 3. He makes the King in Effect the ſole Proprietor of our Eſtates, and ſaith, *we muſt ſupply his Occaſions, tho* five hundred *at once*

Three Sermons of Subjection, Pr. 1683, *Pref.* p. 4.

Sermon 1. P. 11

(i. e. *a House of Commons*) *should forbid us, because our Gold and Silver bear his Image and*
p. 13. *Superscription.* The meaning is this, the King has Power to Tax us without the Consent of Parliament. 4. He adds, *and to this* (i. e. to supply the King without the Consent of Parliament) *we are bound in Conscience, though the Prince should be an U-*
p. 13, 14, *surper and a Tyrant:* Nay, saith our Au-
15. thor, *a Violent and Originally unjust Power, by success becomes a Legal and Righteous Authority.* 5. He complains that *the Rights of the People were* too much *swell'd, their Properties too* much *enlarged, their Liberties*
p. 17. too much *extended.* This was in the Year 1683. when the Popish Plot had been stifled, sham-Plots set on Foot for the Destruction of the best Patriots, the Rights and Franchises of Cities and Corporations undermined and violated, Parliaments disgraced, Popery and Slavery breaking in irresistibly upon us under the Conduct and Influence of the then Duke of *York.* 6. He affirms, *that the Prince is accountable to none but God for any misgovernment, nay he is in Effect,* continues he, *the sole Sovereign Power, if he pleases to Usurp and Exercise it, nor*
p. 21. *can the Subject conscientiously resist him.* 7. He thinks *it's one main ground of Political Government, to deprive the Subject from being his own Judge and Asserter of his own Priviledges.*
p. 22. 8. He conceives *the Kings Coronation Oath is a voluntary Act of Grace, unto which he is not*

ob-

obliged by the Fundamental Conſtitution. 9. *If a Prince ſhould not give this Aſſurance, it is my Judgment* (ſaith he) *he is not obliged to govern ſtrictly by the preſent Law.* P. 23. Ibid.

I doubt I have tired the Reader with theſe *Political Maxims*. *Sibthorp* and *Mainwaring* were dull Fellows to this *grand Maſter of Politicks*, who has left it wholly to his Prince's good Nature, whether he will make uſe of his *multitude of Believers*, or no. He is the *ſole ſoveraign Power*, and *not obliged to take the Coronation Oath*, or to *govern according to the Eſtabliſhed Laws*, if we may believe our *Rector*.

I will not trouble my ſelf, or the Reader, by making Remarks upon theſe Paſſages, which are but a few, of many, with which his Three Sermons abound. All theſe you may find in the firſt.

Theſe Sermons were deſign'd (as he tells us, and I dare believe him) *To aſſure the higher Powers of his ſteadineſs and fidelity, and of many more in theſe Northern Climates.* It was a Point of mighty Conſequence to *the higher Powers, to be aſſured of the Rector's Fidelity*, eſpecially in a time when *the Prince was under ſome diſadvantage.* Moſt happy Prince! who can aſſure himſelf of the Fidelity of ſuch a Man as Mr. *G.* for in him he aſſures himſelf of *many more in theſe Northern Climates.* The higher Powers then in being, were highly obliged to ſo Profound a Caſuiſt, who by another Pref. to the Serm. p. 3.

Tentamen Novum, attempted to prove the *Jus Divinum* of Abſolute Monarchy, and Arbitrary Government: But all well-deſerving Expectants have not the Happineſs of being Preferred according to their Merits.

But to return to his Parallel.

3. The Council at *Jeruſalem*, under the Conduct of the Holy Ghoſt, injoyn'd the *neceſſary forbearance* of a *few* things *to avoid offence*, Acts 15. 28. The Convocation has made Canons, injoyning the Practiſe of abundance of *unneceſſary things* to create offence. That Council widen'd the Door to Church-Fellowſhip, by taking away the *ancient ceremonial Terms* of Communion, and breaking down the *partition Wall* between *Jews* and *Gentiles*: The Convocation has *ſtraitned* the *Door* to *Church-Fellowſhip*, by ſetting up *new ceremonial Terms* of Communion, and erecting a *partition Wall* between Brethren.

4. The Council at *Jeruſalem* freed the Chriſtians from a *divine Yoke*, namely, *Circumciſion*; the Convocation binds a *humane Yoke* of burthenſome Ceremonies on our Necks. The Apoſtles aſſerted that *Chriſtian Liberty*, which the Lord Jeſus purchaſed at a dear rate, and obliged us to maintain, *Gal.* 5. 1. Others unjuſtly deprive us of it, and mancipate us under more beggarly Elements than thoſe of the Jewiſh Pedagogy, *Gal.* 4. 9. Had the *Apoſtles Succeſſors* imitated the excellent temper of

of their wiſe *Fathers* in this Council, the Chriſtian World had not been divided into ſo many Factions as it is at this Day. When *Rehoboam's little Finger* proves heavier than *Solomon's Loins*, no wonder there is a *Schiſm* in *Iſrael*.

5. The Council at *Jeruſalem* made no *new Canon*, only thought fit to continue ſome *divine Prohibitions*, that were obliging before, *Acts* 15. 29. The Convocation hath made but 141 *new Canons*, concerning moſt of which there is no *Divine Law*. The Canons of that Council are contained in *one ſhort Verſe*, v. 29. The Canons of our Synod make a large Volume.

6. The Canons of that Council have no Penalty annexed; the Decree of the Council ends thus, *v.* 29. *From which if ye keep your ſelves, ye ſhall do well. Fare ye well.* Our Canons thunder out terrible *Anathema's*, and *Excommunications*, *ipſo facto*, not known to the Apoſtles, againſt all the breakers of them.

7. The Canons at *Jeruſalem* were made by the *Apoſtles*, *Elders*, and the *whole Church*, v. 22. Our Canons are made by the *Biſhops and Presbyters in Convocation*, which are the true Church of *England* by repreſentation, as Can. 139. obligeth us to believe, on pain of *Excommunication*. Mr. *G.* makes the Parliament *to repreſent the Multitude of Believers*, that is, the *Church*, according to his Parallel; for he makes the Biſhops to anſwer the

the Apoſtles, the Presbyters the Elders, and the Parliament the whole Church, or *multitude of Believers.*

I leave the Rector to the Cenſure of his Dioceſan, who is obliged by the Canon, *to Excommunicate, and not to reſtore him, until he repent, and publickly revoke this his wicked error* *, in affirming the *Parliament* to be the *Church repreſentative*, inſtead of the *Convocation.*

*Can. 139

I hope the Impartial Reader is now fully convinced how exactly the Epiſcopal Government, as deſcribed by this Gentlemen, agrees with the Council at *Jeruſalem.*

He is angry with *J. O.* for ſaying *Pariſh Prieſts have no power of Diſcipline*; and Anſwers, *They have power to rebuke and admoniſh, and ſuſpend for a while from the Lord's Supper.*

Pref. p. 14.

This is in effect an acknowledgment of the Truth of what *J. O.* Aſſerts. They have power *to rebuke and admoniſh*, ſo have private Perſons, *Lev.* 19. 17. *Col.* 3. 16. The Admonitions of a Maſter, who hath no Power to uſe the Rod, will have little influence upon froward Lads. But *Pariſh Miniſters can ſuſpend for a while*: For how long? But for fourteen Days at the fartheſt; and then they are obliged to put the whole Matter out of their Power, and to commit it to the Ordinary. See the *Rubrick before the Communion.*

The true State of the Caſe is this:

1. They

1. They have no power left them to judge whom to Baptize, and whom not, but muſt Baptize all that are offered, though the Children of *Jews*, *Infidels*, *Deiſts*, &c. who have no right to the Priviledges of the Covenant of Grace. *Can.* 68.

2. They have no power to forbear giving the Euchariſt to any one, how notorious an Offender ſoever, unleſs they will proſecute him at the Biſhop's Court, nor then, but for once: So that if he pays his Fees, and be Abſolved there, though the Miniſter know him to be never ſo Impenitent, he muſt give it him the next time. And the Proſecution is ſo troubleſome, odious and fruitleſs, that it is very rarely undertaken.

3. They have no Power to call Perſons to Repentance openly before the Church.

4. They have no Power to judge any Perſon to be Excommunicate, nor to abſolve any Perſon that is Penitent after Excommunication; they only read the Chancellor's Sentence (who is uſually a Lay-man) ſent them in the Biſhop's Name; much like our *Cryers* in Civil Courts, that publiſh the Orders of the Court. Yea, though they are ſatisfied in their Conſciences, that the Chancellor's Decree is ſometimes unjuſt, *Et clave errante*, Excommunicating a Conſciencious Perſon ſcrupling a Ceremony (as was done in the late Reigns) or abſolving an Impenitent Perſon, who hath Commuted for Notorious Scandal, yet they muſt publiſh

publiſh it, or be Suſpended. All the Power left them, is the Privilege of being the Chancellor's Servants to execute all his Decrees, without once Examining whether they be right or wrong.

Many Sober Conformiſts, who have a tender concern for the Souls under their Charge, have complained of this Reſtraint, and impute the growing Debaucheries of the People to the want of Pariſh Diſcipline.

The very Liturgy complains, That the *Godly Primitive Diſcipline* is wanting in our Churches. See the *Office of Commination.*

If the Pariſh-Miniſters have *the Power of Diſcipline*, as the *Rector* would have us believe, the more to blame they for admitting all Perſons promiſcuouſly to the Lord's Supper. It is rarely that any ſcandalous Perſons are excluded, as they ought to be, Mat 18. 15, 16, 17. 1 Cor. 5. 2 Cor. 3. 6.

His Fancy that our Miniſters *ask leave of the Lay-Elders to Suſpend* is a great miſtake. Though common Senſe might teach him, that two or three Experienced Perſons of the Congregation (whom he Stiles *Lay-Elders*) in conjunction with the Miniſters, are more competent Judges of Offences within the Congregation, than a *Lay-Chancellor*, who lives at a diſtance, and is a meer Stranger, and uſually makes the beſt advantage of his Office, without any great regard to the Salvation of Souls.

He complains, *That the Diſſenters call them Prieſts*

Prieſts in contempt, though the Word be but Presbyter contracted. P. 13.

1. I know no Reaſon why this Gentleman ſhould be offended that we call them by a Name which themſelves are ſo fond of. The Words *Prieſthood* and *Prieſts* are uſed five or ſix times in the Form of *Ordination*: And the Word *Miniſter* was chang'd by the Reformers of the *Common Prayer*, in 1662. into that of *Prieſt*, at leaſt in five places, in the *Abſolution*, in the *Reſponſes*, in the *Litany*, and at the *Communion*, &c.

2. Admit it to be a Contraction of *Presbyter*, we muſt conſider Words *non a quo, ſed ad quid*, as the School-men ſpeak, not as they did Originally ſignifie, but as they do at Preſent. It is certain that the Learned Tranſlators of the *New Teſtament* never render the *Greek Presbyter* by Prieſt in *Engliſh*, and they had reaſon for it, becauſe the Word *Prieſt* in common uſe, ſignifies *the Sacrificing Prieſts of the Law, whoſe name is never in the New Teſtament given to Miniſters of the Church*, as Dr. *Fulk* obſerves againſt the *Rhemiſh Seminary*, who quarrel with our firſt Reformers, for Tranſlating πρεσβύτερος *Elder* and not *Prieſt*. *Rhem. in Act* 14. *S.* 4.

The Hebrew כֹּהֵן, and the Greek ἱερὸς, are generally Tranſlated *Prieſt* in our *Engliſh* Bibles, and they properly ſignifie *Sacrificing Prieſts*.

Our Author confeſſeth, *That it is very requiſite that we ſhould not know of any interruption* *Preſ.* p. 14.

ruption in the Succeſſion of Holy Orders; but it is infinite Satisfaction when we have a moral aſſurance that there has been none.

P. 168. to 178. *J. O.* hath prov'd in his Plea, that the Succeſſion has been interrupted, and that it's morally impoſſible by this Principle, for any Man to know himſelf to be a true Miniſter of Chriſt: But our Rector never takes notice of it; not unlike ſome ſort of Diſputants, who reſolve to hold the Concluſion, let what will come of the Premiſes.

He that *has moral aſſurance that there has been no Interruption*, which begets in the Rector *infinite Satisfaction*, muſt be ſure, that he who Ordain'd him was Ordain'd by a Canonical Biſhop: that *that* Biſhop's Ordination was not void by Canon; particularly he muſt be ſure to know he came not in by *Simony*, that he was not an *Heretick*, or Erroneous in the Fundamentals, or Ordain'd by a Biſhop out of his own Province: He muſt know that all the Biſhops ſucceſſively, from the Apoſtles times, by whom he derives his claim, were thus Ordain'd: one Interruption ſpoils the whole Line. He muſt be able to diſprove all the Interruptions mention'd by Hiſtorians. He muſt prove that *Sergius* the II. did not obtain the Popedom by *Magic*, which he himſelf confeſſed he did, that *Liberius* did not ſubſcribe the *Arian* Confeſſion in the Council of *Sirmium*, that Pope *Honorius* in the ſecond General Council was

Naucl. p. 742.

wrong-

wrongfully condemn'd for a Heretick, that *Marcellinus* was no Idolater, nor *Celeſtine* a Neſtorian Heretick, that the Charge of *Simony* put in againſt the *Engliſh* Biſhops, ſcarce one excepted among King *Henry* IVth's Biſhops was falſe. *Vide* Fox *Acts*--*ad* A. D. 1405.

If any one of theſe be true, as all may be for ought we know to the contrary, and a thouſand the like, the Succeſſion of Ordaining Biſhops is interrupted, and the Ordinations of all that derive from them are a nullity. See the Learned Reaſons of the Biſhop of *Worceſter* againſt this Succeſſion. *Iren.* p. 299.

The Scriptures no where mention this Succeſſion. Where was the Succeſſion of the *Jewiſh* High-Prieſts, when the *Roman Governours* ſet up whom they pleas'd, and chang'd them annually, without regard to the Divine Law? See *John* 11. 51. *Joſeph Antiq.* xviii. 3.

Where ſhall we find the Succeſſion when the Woman is in the Wilderneſs, and the Witneſſes ſlain? Goſpel Ordinances are plain things and not clog'd with inſuperable difficulties.

But ſo much is ſaid to this Subject in *J. O*'s Plea, that it is needleſs to add more.

To juſtifie their Ordinations, ſaith Mr. *G. by the Example of the* Lollards, *is but to talk of Yeſterday, of thoſe who appeared not in the World till about* Henry III's *Reign.* *Pref.* p. 15.

1. *J. O.* gave about twelve Inſtances of Ordination by *Presbyters*, *all more Ancient than this* of the Followers of *Wickliff*. Our *Plea* cap. x. p. 125.

Au-

Author according to his great Candor, overlooks all the reſt, and attacks only this late Inſtance: And why this? That he might ſay, *it was but of Yeſterday.* And yet his *Yeſterday* is above four hundred Years ago, for King *Henry* III. dyed in the Year 1272.

2. The *Lollards*, as they were call'd in contempt, were famous Witneſſes againſt Antichriſtian Errors in their Time, and abundance of them ſeal'd their Teſtimony with their Blood. We cannot therefore judge ſo lightly of their Practiſe as the *Rector* doth.

It is true, they *labour'd under great Difficulties*, as he obſerveth, but that was not the Reaſon of Presbyters Ordaining among them, but their aſſerting *an inherent Power in Presbyters as ſuch to ordain*, as *J. O.* hath prov'd out of *Walſingham's* Hiſt. *p.* 339. in the very Place, which he animadverts upon, but it was not his Intereſt to take notice of it.

3. This Inſtance is the more conſiderable, becauſe the *Lollards* were the off-ſpring of the Ancient *Waldenſes*, as *Perrin* obſerves, *In* England, ſaith he, *they were call'd* Lollards *from one* Lollard *who taught there.* The perſecuted *Waldenſes* being ſcatter'd fled into *Provence*, and the *Alps*, ſome into *Calabria*, *Bohemia*, *Polonia*, and into *Britain*, as *Thuanus* obſerves.

Hiſt. *Wald.* lib. 1. c 3.

Lib. v. *ad* A. D. 1550. *Pref.*

So that this is a further Confirmation that the *Waldenſes* had no Biſhops of the preſent *Engliſh* Species.

But

But, ſaith our Author, *As for* Waldenſes, *or* Vaudois *having had no other Miniſters than Presbyters, ordain'd by Presbyters for near five hundred Years paſt, as* J. O. *affirms, it may prove one, and not the leaſt of his miſtakes, when I ſhall here have ſet down what a Learned Neighbour of mine communicated to me. He told me, that he finds in the Hiſtory of the Church of* Bohemia. 'That 'the Brethren of *Bohemia*, ſuſpecting the 'Validity of Ordination by Presbyters, ſent 'unto the *Waldenſes* (A. D. 1467.) *Michael Zamburgius*, their Rector, with two 'others. Theſe find *Stephen* the *Waldenſian* Biſhop, who with another Biſhop, and 'ſome Miniſters create *Zamburgius*, and his 'two Companions, Biſhops, conferring on 'them the Power to Ordain Miniſters. '*This is ſufficient*, ſaith he, *to make a Man* '*doubt* J. O's *Quotations*. P. 15, *and* 16.

This Quotation, which Mr. *G.* borrow'd of his *Learned Neighbour*, and Triumphs in as a wonderful diſcovery of the State of the *Waldenſes*, he might have found in *J. O*'s Plea, *p.* 157. quoted out of the *Hiſtory of* Bohemia, to which he refers his Reader in the Margin of his Book.

The *Rector* is a ſingular Man for anſwering Books, who muſt be obliged to his *Learned Neighbours* for a Quotation, which any Common Reader cou'd find in the Book which he undertakes to Anſwer. A Man who reads Books with ſo *little Obſervation*,

may be preſum'd to anſwer them with *leſs* Judgment.

The Reader may ſee the Remarks upon that Story in *J. C's Plea*, which may convince him, that the *Waldenſian Biſhops* were only the *Senior Paſtors*, with whom the Power of Ordination was entruſted for Orders ſake, as was done here in the late Times of Presbytery, and is ſtill both here and in the Foreign Reformed Churches. In all Ordinations by Presbyters, there is a Moderator, or Preſident, who is the Chief Manager of the Action for Order's ſake, but in Conjunction with his Brethren, over whom he claims no Juriſdiction or Superiority in Power. This was the State of the *Waldenſes*, their Biſhops were only *Nominal* and *Titular*, but had no Power over their Brethren: They were only for Orders ſake the Principal Managers of Ordination. This appears,

1. Becauſe it was their received Doctrine that all Presbyters are *in a State of Parity*. To this purpoſe they ſpeak in a certain *Confeſſion of their Faith*, Art. V. *We hold that the Miniſters of the Church ought not to have any Superiority over the Clergy.*

Perr. Hiſt. I. 13.

Æneas Silvius, who wrote a Book of their Doctrines, reports this concerning them, that they affirm *the* Roman *Biſhop to be equal to other Biſhops, and that between Prieſts there is no difference.*

Inter ſacerdotes nullum diſcrimen, Boh. *Hiſt. de* Vald. *Dogm.*

The ſame is affirm'd concerning them by *Nau-*

Nauclerus, he repreſents them ſaying, *That all Prieſts are equal, and it is not any Superiour Dignity, but the Merits of their Converſation that advances ſome above others.* *Chronog.* Vol. 2. *Gen.* 47.

This was the conſtant Doctrine of our *Engliſh* Apoſtle *John Wickliff*, and his Followers, as *Walſingham* Notes, in ſeveral Places. *Vide* Hiſt. *Arg. ad* Ann. Dom 1389.

This alſo was the Doctrine of the *Bohemians*, who were enlighten'd by *Wickliff*'s Books. The *Taborites* in their Confeſſion ſay, That *the conferring of Orders only by Biſhops, and that they have greater Authority than other Miniſters, is not from any Faith or Authority of the Scriptures, but from the Cuſtom of the Church.* *Ex conſuetudine habetur eccleſiæ.* Lyd. Wald. *p.* 23.

The Biſhops they receiv'd from the *Waldenſes*, were made by two of their *Titular Biſhops*, and ſome Presbyters, which beſpeaks them to be no Superiour Order of Miniſters, for Presbyters cannot make Biſhops of the *Engliſh* Species. *Hiſt. of the Perſec. of* Bohem.

One of the Articles againſt *John Hus*, the *Bohemian* Martyr, was that he affirm'd, That *all Prieſts are of like Power, and that the Reſervation of the Caſualties, the ordering of Biſhops, and the Conſecration of Prieſts were invented only for Covetouſneſs.* *Acts and Mon. in* Conc. Conſtant.

2. That they had no real Biſhops Superiour to Presbyters is evident from their own Teſtimony. The *Papiſts* miſrepreſented them (as ſome others would do now) that they had Biſhops, *to whom they*

paid a mighty deference. This was moſt falſe, as *Perrin* evinceth out of their own Writings. *The Monk* Rainerius (ſaith he) *reports many things touching the Vocation of the Paſtors of the* Waldenſes, *which never were. As that which is impoſed upon them, that they have one greater* Biſhop, *and two Followers, which he calls the Elder Son and the Younger, and a Deacon, that he laid his Hands on others with Sovereign Authority, and ſent them whither he thought good, like a Pope.* That they had no ſuch Biſhop, he proves out of the Book of the *Paſtors*, *George Maurel*, and *Peter Maſcon*, who give this account of their Diſcipline.

Hiſt. Wald. I. 10.

The laſt that are Receiv'd (or Ordain'd) *are to do nothing without the Leave and Licenſe of their Seniours Receiv'd* (or Ordain'd) *before them; as alſo, they that are firſt ought not to attempt any thing without the Approbation of their Companions, to the end that all things might be done amongſt us in Order.*

The Reader may note here,

1. That the *Waldenſian Biſhops* were only the *Seniour Paſtors.*

2. That theſe had no Power over other Miniſters.

3. That they cou'd not put forth any Act of Government, *without the Approbation of their Brethren*: So that the *Waldenſian Churches* were Govern'd *by the Common Council of the Presbyters or Paſtors.*

4. All this was for *Order's ſake.* I leave it

it to the Impartial, to Judge whether this ſort of Government has any thing of the Form of our Epiſcopal Government.

Theſe Teſtimonies are ſufficient to ſatisfie unprejudiced Perſons, that the *Waldenſes* had no Biſhops Superiour to Presbyters, but I will add a few more *ex abundanti*.

3. That they had no Biſhops in a proper Senſe appears by Father *Paul*'s deſcription of them. 'The People of the *Valleys* were 'a part of the *Waldenſes*, who four *hundred* 'Years ſince * forſook the Church of *Rome*, 'and in regard of the Perſecutions, fled in- 'to *Polonia*, *Germany*, *Puglia*, *Provence*, and 'ſome of them into the Valleys of *Mount-* 'ſenis, *Lucerna*, *Angronia*, *Peroſa*, and St. 'Martin. Theſe having always continued 'in their Separation with certain Miniſters 'of their own, whom they called *Paſtors*, 'when the Doctrine of *Zuinglius* was plan- 'ted in *Geneva*, did preſently unite them- 'ſelves with thoſe, as agreeing with them 'in Points of Doctrine and principal Rites. Thus he.

* *He ends his Hiſtory with the Year* 1563.

Hiſt. of C. of Trent, Lib. V. *ad A.D.* 1559

Obſerve in this Quotation,

1. He aſcribes to the *Waldenſes certain Miniſters* (not Biſhops) whom they call'd *Paſtors*. If there had been any Superiour Biſhops among them, ſo exact an Hiſtorian would not have omitted them.

2. He ſaith, they *agreed in Doctrines and Rites* with thoſe of *Geneva*.

3. They presently *united with them by reason of this agreement.*

I hope the *Rector* will not affirm, That the Protestants of *Geneva* had *Bishops*; no more had the *Waldenses*, who agreed with them in Rites and Doctrines, and among other Doctrines in this of *the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters*, and so readily united with them.

I doubt it will not be so easie to reconcile this Gentleman to the *Doctrines* and *Rites* of *Geneva*. To be sure then his Notions of Episcopacy are very different from those of the Anti-Popish *Waldenses*.

4. That they had no Bishops may be further evidenced by their Ordinations here in *England*, which were by Presbyters and not by Bishops.

Ut eorum Presbyteri, more Pontificum, novos crearent Presbyteros. Hist. Ang. P. 339. ad A.D. 1389

Walsingham saith, *That their Presbyters, after the manner of Pontifs* (or Bishops) *created new Presbyters, affirming that every Priest had as great power of binding and loosing, and performing all other Ecclesiastical Acts, as the Pope himself hath or can give.*

This was not a case of meer necessity, for they assert an inherent Power in Presbyters to Ordain. These Presbyters made by Presbyters, were the eminent Witnesses against Anti-christian Usurpations in this Land, and many of them Sacrificed their Lives for the *Testimony of Jesus*.

Their Ordinations, though private, by reason of the Iniquity of the Times, were many

many and considerable. If they Ordain'd Ministers in K. *Rich.* II. time, as *Walsingham* saith they did, much more under K. *Henry* IV. and the following Reigns, when they could not have Episcopal Ordinations, if they had desired them; the Bishops being become their mortal Enemies, and conspiring their Destruction by the bloody Statute *de Hæreticis comburendis*, and Arch-Bishop *Arundel*'s wicked *Constitutions*. *Ubi supra.*

In the Year 1401. I find one of their Presbyters burnt at *Smithfield*. *Walsingham*, according to the old Popish Hypothesis, that none but Bishops cou'd Ordain, calls him *Pseudo-Presbyter*, a false Presbyter. *Hist* p. 364

In the Year 1414. *William Cleydon*, an inveterate Lollard (as the Monk calls him) made his own Son a Priest. It is not to be doubted but he was a Presbyter himself, though not Popishly Ordain'd, and with the Assistance of others Ordain'd his Son. *In tantam dementiam ruerat---ut etiam filium proprium sacerdotem constitueret.*

Mr. *William Swinderby*, an Eminent and Learned Confessor, in the Sentence which the Bishop of *Hereford* past upon him, is said *to pretend himself to be a Priest*. Had he been Ordain'd by a Bishop, he had been a *real Priest*, in the Bishop's account, but having no such Ordination he calls him *a pretended Priest*. *Hist. Arg.* p. 390. *Acts & Mon. ad A. D.* 1391.

Mr. *W. Thorp* went to the *Lollards*, and by them was sent to Preach. The Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* tells him, *That no Bishop would admit him to Preach, and that he was not sent or licensed by them*, They *Ibid ad A.* 1407. p. 514, 516.

Ibid. They could not ſubmit to Epiſcopal Ordinations, without taking *unlawful Oaths*, as Mr. *Thorp* ſaith to the Arch-Biſhop; before whom he proves the Truth of their *Miſſion*, from the Succeſs of their Miniſtry in the Converſion of Souls. *Since this aforeſaid witneſſing of God*, ſaith he, *ſufficeth to all true Preachers, we think that we do not the office of Prieſthood, if that we leave our Preaching, becauſe that we have not, or may not have duly Biſhops Letters to witneſs, that we are ſent of them to Preach.*

Letters of Licenſe from the Biſhop were invented here about this time, to obſtruct the courſe of the Goſpel.

John Purvey, a Learned Writer againſt Popery, ſaith in one of his Books, *That every holy Man, who is a Miniſter of Chriſt, although he be not ſhaven, is a true Prieſt Ordain'd of God, although no* Mitred Biſhop *ever lay his Character upon him.*

Act. & Mon. p. 529.

We read of Four Miniſters in the famous Congregation at *Hamerſham*, who all died Martyrs for the Truth. *Tho. Man*, call'd Dr. *Man*, one of them, confeſſed that he had turn'd 700 People to his Doctrine. He was burnt in *Smithfield*. Another of them, *Tileſworth*, call'd Dr. *Tilſworth*, was burnt at *Amerſham*: The third, *Rob. Coſin*, otherwiſe call'd Dr. *Coſin*, was burnt in *Buckingham*: The fourth was hang'd in the Biſhop of *Lincoln*'s Priſon. The three former were formally declared Hereticks, and delivered up to the Secular Power, but none of them are own'd for Prieſts by their Judges, or *degraded* by them, which they muſt have been

been by the Popiſh Laws, had they been Ordain'd by Biſhops, before the Secular Arm could reach them.

One *Tho. Arthur*, who at length Abjured (as ſeveral others did, and yet afterwards died Martyrs) about the Year 1531. as he anſwer'd to ſome Articles of *Wickliff*'s Doctrine laid to his Charge, told the People, *Good People, if I ſhould ſuffer Perſecution for the preaching of the Goſpel of God, yet there is ſeven Thouſand more that would preach the Goſpel of God, as I do now.* Note here, *Ib.* p. 973.

1. That the Preachers of *Wickliff*'s Doctrine were very numerous here at this time; Mr. *Arthur* affirms them to be 7000, perhaps he puts a definite for an indefinite Number, alluding to the 7000 in *Iſrael*, that had not bow'd down the Knee to *Baal*. It cannot be denied but by 7000 he intends a great number.

2. This great number of Miniſters muſt be Ordain'd by Presbyters, for the Biſhops would *ſend none of them*, as was obſerved before. They clog'd their Ordinations with ſuch *hard conditions*, as the Conſcientious *Lollards* could not comply with, and uſed all the precautions poſſible to hinder their Preaching.

We ſee here, notwithſtanding the ſevere Perſecutions againſt the poor *Lollards*, they grew and increas'd exceedingly, as the *Iſraelites* in *Egypt*, and had ſo many Thouſands of Faithful and Laborious Miniſters, who

who muſt be Ordain'd by Presbyters, the Biſhops being their Sworn Enemies, and obliged by their *Pontifical Oath* to extirpate them.

The *Lollards* here were a Branch of the old *Waldenſes*, as we prov'd before, and as may be gathered from that Paſſage in *Rainerius*, who ſaith, *There is hardly any Country, into which this Sect hath not made a ſhift to creep.* *Contra. Wald. c. 4.*

And being I am upon this Quotation, I will obſerve one thing in *Rainerius*; he ſaith they were *more pernicious to the Church of* Rome, *than any other Sect*, for three Reaſons. 1. 'Becauſe more laſting; for ſome 'ſay that it hath been ever ſince the time 'of *Silveſter*, and others deduce it ſince the 'time of the Apoſtles. 2. Becauſe more 'general; there is hardly any Country into 'which it hath not crept. 3. Becauſe all 'others are abominable to God for the im-'manity of their Blaſphemies; but this of 'the *Waldenſes* only carries with it a great 'ſhew of Piety, becauſe they live juſtly be-'fore Men, and believe truly of God, and 'all the Articles of the Creed, only they 'blaſpheme and hate the *Roman* Church.

If they are ſo Ancient as *Rainerius* ſeems to confeſs, and had no Biſhops, as I have prov'd, *J. O's.* Aſſertion, *That they had no Biſhops for* 500 *Years* holds good, nay, he might have ſaid 1500 Years, according to this account of *Rainerius*.

I hope

I hope I have ſufficiently prov'd that the *Waldenſes* had Superiour Biſhops for 500 Years laſt paſt, and Explain'd, or rather Vindicated his *Learned Neighbour*'s (as he calls it) but indeed *J. O*'s. *Quotation*.

He concludes his *Preface* with a *ſtrong preſumption and moral aſſurance of the uninterrupted Succeſſion of Orders*. p. 17.

It ſhould ſeem, if I underſtand him, *that a ſtrong preſumption* and *moral aſſurance*, are one and the ſame with him, which moſt will acknowledge to be very different things. Or does he mean, that ſome of them have *ſtrong preſumptions*, others have *moral aſſurance* of the Succeſſion? Or rather, that their *moral aſſurance* is no more than a *ſtrong preſumption*, and ſo the meaning is, they ſtrongly preſume they are Miniſters, but cannot be certain upon this Principle. This is but very cold comfort to one who labours under Fears and Temptations, about his acceptance with God in the Exerciſe of his Miniſtry. The inextricable difficulties about the Succeſſion, which have puzzled the moſt Learned and diligent Inquirers, may increaſe, but can have no tendency to remove his Doubts.

The *Waldenſes* prov'd their Call to the Miniſtry by the *Succeſs*, and not by the *Succeſſion* of it, as we noted before; and inſtead of perplexing their Heads with an *uninterrupted Succeſſion*, they aſſerted this Poſition, *Such as hear* (or obey) *the word of God*, *Acts Mon.* p. 234.

God, and have a right Faith, are the right Church of Christ; and to this Church the Keys of the Church are given, to drive away Wolves, and to institute true Pastors.

Nor are they singular in this Principle, it is asserted by the Learned Defenders of the *Reformation* (in their Discourses against the *Jesuits*, the stiff Maintainers of this Succession) and they have demonstrated, That the Being of the Christian Church cannot depend upon this Succession, and that it hath been interrupted again and again. There may be a sort of Succession without a true Church, as in the Romish false Church; there may be a true Church without a Succession, as the Foreign Reformed Churches. Mr. *Hooker* affirms the whole Church visible, the true original Subject of all Power, and thence infers, that a continued Succession of Bishops is not necessary to Ordination.

Eccl. Polit. Lib. VII. p. 37, 38.

This *Strongly Presumptuous* Gentleman should have answered *J. O's* Reasons against this Succession, before he had talk'd of his *moral assurance* concerning it. But some people are never more *sure*, than when they are furthest from *Truth*.

Thus I have follow'd him through his tedious *Preface*, let not the Reader blame me for want of Method in some places, because I follow the Author in his Digressions.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Jewiſh *Church, not the firſt eſtabliſhed Church. The Levitical Prieſthood, no Pattern for Goſpel Miniſters.* Clemens Romanus *Vindicated. Whether Jeſus Chriſt modell'd his Church after the* Jewiſh *Pattern, or left it in a State of Oligarchy, as our Author ſaith. His* (1.) *inſtance of Ordination from* Acts 1. *conſider'd.* (2.) *The Ordination of the ſeven Deacons. They were Miniſters of Tables, not of the Word and Sacraments. Prov'd from Scripture and Antiquity. Objections anſwer'd* (3.) *His third inſtance of Ordination from* Act. 9. 17. *conſider'd.* (4.) *His fourth from* Acts 13. 1, 2, 3. *This inſtance of Ordination by Presbyters vindicated. His account of Apoſtles and Prophets examin'd.* (5.) *His inſtance from* Acts 14. 13. *examin'd.* (6.) Acts 19. 6, 7. *conſider'd.* (7.) 1 Cor. 5. 3, 4, 5. *vindicated.* (8.) 1 Tim. 4. 14. *For Ordination by Presbyters, vindicated.*

cated. Dr. Owen *defended. The Rector unsound in the Doctrine of Justification.* (9.) 1 Pet. 5. 2. *vindicated.*

HE takes a great deal of pains to prove that the Apostles were Superiour to Presbyters, which no Body ever deny'd. This is the chief Scope of the first Chapter of his Book, in which he hath furnished us with some rare Notions of Church Government.

P. 1. He tells us, *that the Church of the* Jews *was the first established Church in the World, that we know of.*

Had God no Church in the World for about 2450 Years, till the Law was given upon Mount *Sinai?* Were there no worshipping Congregations, no *Divine* Laws of Worship in the World before *Moses*'s Time? We read of *Sacrifices* and *Invocation on the Name of the Lord*, Gen. 4. 3, 4, 24. And were there no Assemblies for those Acts of Worship? We read of the *Sons of God*, as distinct from *the Daughters of Men*, and that the mixture of the professedly *Holy Seed* of *Seth* with the prophane *Cainites*, fill'd the World with Wickedness, *Gen.* 6. The degeneracy of the *Sons of God*, the visible Church of God at that Time, caus'd the Flood. He that can believe that God had no Church before the Flood, may also believe there never was a Flood.

Did

Did *Noah*, the Father of the new World, who had immediate Revelation from God, as moſt of the Patriarchs had, eſtabliſh no Church among his numerous Poſterity? Was God indifferent whether he would have a Church? Or was *Noah* unfaithful in tranſmitting the *Divine Eſtabliſhment* to his Off-ſpring? It is true, they ſoon degenerated, *Gen.* 11. but that's an Argument they had been a Covenant-People.

Was there no Church eſtabliſh'd in *Abraham's numerous* and *princely Family?* Gen. 14. 14. & 23. 6. He erected Altars for Sacrifice, and call'd upon the Lord whereever he came. God renew'd his Covenant with him, and admitted his *Infant Seed* by Circumciſion into a viſible Church-membership, whereby they were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the World.

Did righteous *Melchizedeck*, King of *Salem*, who was *Prieſt of the moſt High God*, as the Patriarchs generally were, take no care to eſtabliſh a Church among his Subjects?

I hope one may lawfully doubt this Gentleman's Notions of *Church-Government*, who thus blunders about the very *exiſtence of a Church.*

But, continues he, *The* Jewiſh *Church was govern'd by a High-Prieſt, Inferior Prieſts, and Levites.* P. 1.

1. I begin now to ſuſpect the Reaſon, why he would have no eſtabliſh'd Church be-

before the *Jewiſh*, he does not read of any *ſubordinate Prieſts* and *Levites*, that were ſubject to the *Patriarchal Prieſts*. He ſeems to be content that God ſhould have no Church in the World for almoſt 2500 Years, rather than want a Model for his Hierarchy, conſiſting of *Biſhops*, *Prieſts* and *Deacons*: This is agreeable enough to his Hypotheſis, that Dioceſan Biſhops are eſſential to a Church.

2. The High-Prieſt, Prieſts and Levites are not the Model for Goſpel Churches, for we read of no Inſtitution of *Biſhops*, *Prieſts* and *Deacons* in the New Teſtament. We find *Biſhops* and *Deacons* there, *Phil.* 1. 1. but the Scripture-Biſhop is the ſame with the Scripture-Presbyter.

3. The *Jewiſh* High-Prieſt was an eminent Type of Jeſus Chriſt, the *High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion*. He is one as the *Jewiſh* High-Prieſt was; and in this reſpect we follow the *Jewiſh* Typical Preſident. We are under Jeſus Chriſt, our only Chief-Prieſt, who hath appointed Presbyters and Deacons, as under Officers in the Chriſtian Church.

4. This is the great Argument of the *Papiſts* for the Pope's Supremacy; the *Jews* had one Chief-Prieſt, therefore the Chriſtians muſt have one Chief-Biſhop.

De Rom. Pontif. I. 9. So *Bellarmine* Argues, It is unhappy, that the Arguments for Dioceſan Epiſcopacy equally ſerve the Papacy.

The

The Fathers, *especially* Clemens Romanus, *saith the Rector*, *seems to make this a President for the Government of Christian Churches by a Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons: The first answering the High Priest, the second the Inferiour Priests, and the third the Levites.* *Ibid.*

Either the *Rector* has never read *Clemens Romanus*, or he disingenuously abuses his Reader, for

1. *Clemens* no where saith, as he makes him to speak, that there were *Bishops*, *Priests* and *Deacons*, as three distinct Officers in the Christian Church.

2. He no where saith, that the *Bishop answer'd the High Priest*, *the Presbyter the Inferiour Priests*, *and the Deacon the Levites.* There is not a Word of this in all that *Epistle to the* Corinthians, to which Mr. *G.* refers us.

3. He mentions but two Orders of New Testament Officers, *Bishops and Deacons. The Apostles*, saith he, *Preaching the Gospel in Countrys and Cities*, *ordain'd the first Fruits of them* (that believ'd) *having tried them by the Spirit to be* Bishops *and* Deacons, *for them that should afterwards believe* *.

* εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους. *Clem. ad Cor.*

The same Officers were in the Church of *Corinth* at this Time, which the Apostle had settled in the Church of *Philippi*, Phil. 1. 1. *Bishops and Deacons.* There were several Bishops in the single Church of *Philippi*, and not one Chief, so in this Church of *Corinth*, which was govern'd by several

Biſhops whom *Clemens* calls Presbyters. Theſe govern'd the Church in Common. He does not mention any chief Biſhop in *Corinth*, but he affirms, that the Presbyters there *perform'd the Duties of their Epiſcopacy* *.

He exhorts the *Corinthians* to be *ſubject to their Elders* *.

I could wiſh this excellent Epiſtle of *Clemens*, which I hear is lately done into *Engliſh*, were in every hand: It would abundantly ſatisfie the unprejudiced, that the Order of Superiour Biſhops had no being in the Church in *Clemens* his Time. He writes to the *Corinthian* Church about Schiſm, and that occaſion'd by ſome of their Presbyters, but has not one Word of *Obedience to a Superiour Dioceſan Biſhop*, as the remedy againſt Schiſm.

The only Paſſage that gives the leaſt umbrage to a Dioceſan Epiſcopacy is that which mentions *High-Prieſts*, *Prieſts*, and *Levites* under the Law, and a little after, *Biſhops* and *Deacons* under the Goſpel. Not that he makes the former Patterns of the latter, for then he would have ſaid, *Biſhops*, *Prieſts* and *Deacons* (as the Rector falſly affirms he doth) but he expreſly ſaith, the Apoſtles inſtituted *Biſhops* and *Deacons*.

We muſt explain *Clemen's Biſhops*, and *Deacons* by the New Teſtament, and not by the Old, for he ſpeaks of an *Apoſtolical Inſtitution* which we muſt look for in *Pauls*

* προςενενεγκοντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.

* ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις.

Pauls Epiſtles, and not *in the Levitical Law.*

Now we find *Biſhops* and *Deacons* in *Phil.* 1. 1. 1 *Tim.* 3. *Paul*'s *Biſhops* and *Clemen*'s *Biſhop* are the ſame. *Paul*'s Biſhops were Presbyters, for there were ſeveral of them in one Church, *Phil.* 1. 1. *Clemen*'s Biſhops are *but* Presbyters, of which there were ſeveral in the Church of *Corinth.*

The force of *Clemens* his Argument is this, As the Old Teſtament Church was guided by a Divine Inſtitution in the *Levitical Prieſthood*, ſo muſt we in the Goſpel-Miniſtry: They reſted in the *Orders* of the Old Law, and we muſt in thoſe of the New Teſtament. The *Orders* are different, as he expreſly declares, but the Authority enjoyning them is the ſame.

That we muſt thus underſtand him appears further from theſe Words of his *, *Even our Apoſtles underſtood by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that there would be ſtrife about the Name of Epiſcopacy; for this very Reaſon therefore, having perfect Knowledge thereof before hand, they ordained the aforeſaid Officers*, i. e. Biſhops and Deacons.

* ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.

Clement obſerves here, (1.) That the Apoſtles did foreſee, there would be Contentions about the *Order* and *Dignity* of Biſhops in the Church. (2.) That they took care to accommodate the Differences about Epiſcopacy, by ſettling *Officers* in the Church. (3.) The Officers they ſettled, were *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, and of theſe Bi-

ſhops there were ſeveral in a Church, who govern'd it in Common, as we find in *Epheſus*, Acts 20. 17, 28. and at *Philippi*, Phil. 1. 1. and here at *Corinth*.

p. 2. *It is manifeſt*, ſaith the *Rector*, *That Jeſus Chriſt whilſt on Earth modell'd his little Flock, according to this Pattern, himſelf being as it were the High-Prieſt, the twelve Apoſtles his ſeconds, and the ſeventy Diſciples ſtill of a lower Rank.*

This is ſpoken with great Aſſurance, *it is manifeſt*, ſaith he, but you muſt take his bare Word for Proof.

1. *Is it manifeſt*, that Jeſus Chriſt was *as it were* the High Prieſt? This is a dangerous Aſſertion, and ſavours of *Socinianiſm*. The *Socinians* deny the reality of Chriſt's Prieſthood and Satisfaction, the *Rector* makes him but *as it were* High Prieſt. If he will be at the Pains to read the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, he will find that Jeſus Chriſt had a *real Prieſthood*, and that he was and is the *High Prieſt of our Profeſſion*. I hope the Rector is no *Socinian*, but when I compare this with ſome odd Paſſages of his about *Juſtification*, of which hereafter, its no breach of Charity to ſay, he ought to clear himſelf from the *appearance of that growing Hereſie*. They that are *ſound in the Faith* ought to ſtudy a *Form of ſound Words*. The Scripture no where calls Jeſus Chriſt *as it were* a High Prieſt. He that can degrade Jeſus Chriſt from the *Honour* of a

real

real Prieſthood, to advance the *honourable Order* of Biſhops, is but *as it were* a Friend, that is no real one to either.

2. *Is it manifeſt*, that the twelve Apoſtles were under Chriſt as the Prieſts under the Chief Prieſts? That they were under him none Queſtions; but not as *Prieſts*, for they were none as all Proteſtants confeſs: And I hope, this Gentleman will not make them Prieſts in a Popiſh Senſe to offer up the *Idolatrous Sacrifice* of the Maſs. The number of Twelve has no relation to the Prieſthood. The Prieſts were divided into twenty four Orders, and not into twelve, 1 *Chron.* 24.

Biſhop *Andrews* makes the twelve Apoſtles to anſwer the Princes of the twelve Tribes, which our Rector miſtook perhaps for twelve Prieſts But be it as it will, he is *manifeſtly miſtaken* in his Notion of the *Apoſtles*, as well as of *Chriſt*. *Form of Govern.* p. 25. Num. 1. 16.

3. *Is it manifeſt*, that the *ſeventy two Diſciples anſwer'd the Levites?* Biſhop *Andrews*, and other Aſſertors of Epiſcopacy make them to anſwer the ſeventy two *Elders*, whom no Man but Mr. *G.* will affirm to be a Bench of *Inferiour Levites*. The Great Council of ſeventy had the ſupream Judicature under *Moſes* (who was not the High Prieſt) which he'll ſcarce allow the *Presbyters*, much leſs the *Deacons*, whom the ſeventy Diſciples repreſented, according to his Parallel. Num. 11. 16.

Having told us how Chriſt *Modelled his Flock*, whilſt he was on Earth, he proceeds to acquaint us in what State he left it at his Death. Here he is at a loſs what to ſay, and yet muſt needs teach his Reader what he does not underſtand himſelf.

p. 2. *He ſeem'd*, ſaith he, *to leave his Church in a State of Oligarchy, or in the Power of Twelve.*

When I read theſe Words, I turn'd to the *Errata*, and expected to find them Corrected there, as *ſight* is put for *blindneſs*, p. 8. but was diſappointed.

Did the Lord Jeſus leave his Church *in a State of Oligarchy?* The Writers of Politicks ſay, that *Oligarchy* is the *Corruption of Ariſtocracy.*

Oligarchy, (ſaith *Burgerſdicius*,) *is the Diſeaſe and Deſtruction of Ariſtocracy:* And he deſcribes it to be the *Oppreſſion of the Multitude by a few of the Nobles, who exclude their Collegues, uſurp the Government, and trample upon the Laws* *.

* *Idea Doct. Pol. Cap. 22. §. 10. 11.*

Bodin, the Famous Lawyer, ſaith, That *Oligarchy is a factious Ariſtocracy, or a Seigniory of a very ſmall number of Lords, as were the thirty* Tyrants *of* Athens, *and the Roman* Triumviri, *who oppreſs'd the Liberty of the People. And for this Reaſon*, adds he, *the Ancients have always taken this Word* Oligarchy *in an evil Part* *.

* *De Republ.* II. 6.

An Error in *Politicks* is excuſable enough in a *Divine*, but a Man, who takes upon him

him to write *Political Sermons*, and to Publiſh a Book of *Church Government*, ſhould not blunder about the *Common Terms* which School-Boys underſtand.

I preſume he meant *Ariſtocracy*, for he explains himſelf, that *Chriſt left his Church in the Power of Twelve*. This alſo is a miſtake, for *Judas*, one of the Twelve, was gone, or going *to his own Place*. It is true, *Matthias* ſucceeded in his Room, but Chriſt left not his Church *in the Power of Twelve*, excluſive of other Apoſtles. *Paul*, who was not one of the Twelve, was not Inferiour to the Chief Apoſtles. Many judge *Barnabas* an Apoſtle of equal Authority with the reſt. 2 Cor. 11. 5. and 12. 11.

He thinks *the Church was govern'd after Chriſt's Aſcenſion by the Apoſtles in a Parity*, that we eaſily grant, but do not underſtand the Proof of it, *For*, ſaith he, *neither did he commit the Power unto the Twelve themſelves, but was wholly ſilent therein.* How then came they by it? He adds, *by Order of Nature, one would think.* p. 2.

One would think the Rector were in a Dream, when theſe Words dropt from him. He makes the Apoſtles to govern the Church by an *uſurped Power*, which *Chriſt never committed to them.* If this be ſo, all their Acts become nullities, which overturns the Foundations of Chriſtianity, and makes their *Epiſcopal Succeſſors* act by an uſurped Power.

You muſt not admire, that he denies the governing Power to *Presbyters*, for the very Apoſtles *had it not from Jeſus Chriſt*, as he poſitively ſpeaks.

He is poſitive, they had it not from Jeſus Chriſt, but is not certain how they came by it, only *he thinks it muſt by Order of Nature fall to their ſhare.*

He ſhou'd help us to a *New Dictionary* to explain his Terms: What he means by the *Order of Nature* is hard to underſtand. If he means by it, that the *Eldeſt ſhould be preferr'd*, as in the *Patriarchal Government*, his Expreſſion is very unproper, for the Apoſtolical Power was not founded in *natural Generation*, but in a *poſitive Inſtitution*, and if the *Order of Nature* muſt carry the Power, the Eldeſt Apoſtle muſt *ſucceed in the Government*, which deſtroys the Parity he allows.

It ſeems he over-look'd, *Mat.* 16. 19. *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. *Mat.* 28. 18, 19, 20. Where Chriſt commits the Power unto his Apoſtles.

We will now proceed to his Scripture Inſtances of Ordination, in which he pretends the Presbyters had no ſhare.

In ſome of his Inſtances, Ordination is not concern'd, in others, Presbyters could not be concern'd, becauſe they were not in being, in others the Presbyters had a hand, as we ſhall evince, notwithſtanding his endeavours to exclude them.

His

I. His firſt Inſtance of Ordination in *Acts* 1. we are not concern'd in, for none ever queſtion'd the Apoſtles Power of Ordaining before this Gentleman, who denies their having a Power from Jeſus Chriſt, and where elſe they could have it, is a Myſtery which Mr. *G.* only is concerned to unfold.

If *Matthias* was Ordain'd, as he ſaith he was, it is an inſtance of Ordination *without Impoſition of Hands*. Dr. *Willet* infers from it, That *Impoſition of Hands* is not *of the Eſſence of Orders*; * which Aſſertion he confirms as the *Proteſtant Doctrine*; and if ſo, perſons may be true Miniſters, though the Biſhops have not laid hands on them.

* *Synop. Pap. Con.* 16. q. 2.

II. His next Inſtance is the Ordination of the Seven Deacons, *Acts* 6. concerning whom he ſaith, *They were deſigned to diſtribute the publick Alms unto the Poor, the multitude of Believers choſe them, the Apoſtles approv'd them, and appointed them over that Buſineſs* (of diſtributing the publick Charity) *by Faſting and Prayer, and laying on of hands*, (v. 6.) *whereby alſo they became Ordained to the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments.* P. 3. & 4.

It's obſervable here;

1. He acknowledges the People's right to chuſe Miniſters; Why then are they deprived of it, and no Overtures made towards the Reſtoring of this Power to them? It were a Province worthy of a *Convocation*, inſtead of laying new Burthens *on the multitude*

titude of Believers, to contribute their Endeavours to have their *Ancient Priviledges* reſtored.

2. He owns that the Imployment whereunto the Seven Deacons were firſt deſign'd, was to *ſerve Tables*; but he adds, of his own, *their Ordination for the Buſineſs made them alſo Miniſters*. But this is a great miſtake:

1. Becauſe the very Apoſtles found it too difficult a Province *to ſerve Tables*, and to attend the *Miniſtry of the Word*, Act. 6. 2. *It is not reaſon that we ſhould leave the Word of God and ſerve Tables*. V. 3, 4. *Wherefore look ye out among you Seven Men---- whom we may appoint over this Buſineſs, but we will give our ſelves continually to Prayer, and to the Miniſtry of the Word.*

The *Miniſtry of the Word*, and the *Serving of Tables* are diſtinct Offices, and *inconſiſtent* in the ordinary exerciſe of *them*, otherwiſe there were no force in the Apoſtles reaſoning, that they muſt not *leave the Word to ſerve Tables*. If ſerving of Tables was a hinderance to the *Apoſtles* Miniſtry, would it not be alſo to that of the *Deacons*. What Abſurdity do they put upon the Apoſtles, who would make them ſay, *We cannot attend the Miniſtry of the Word, and ſerve Tables, wherefore Brethren, chooſe you among you Seven Men, whom we may appoint to do both.*

2. The occaſion of chuſing *Deacons* was the neceſſity of the Poor, whom the Apoſtles were deſirous to have relieved out of the

the publick Alms, and could not do it themſelves, being taken up with the Miniſtry of the Word. The end of the Inſtitution was to *ſerve Tables*, *Acts* 6. 3. Purſuant to this end, the People choſe Seven, not *to Preach*, but to *ſerve Tables*: Purſuant to this choice the Apoſtles *appointed them over that buſineſs, by Faſting, and Prayer, and laying on of Hands*, Acts 6. 3, 6. Here is not one Syllable of Ordination *to the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments*. The end of the *Inſtitution, Choice and Ordination*, was to Serve Tables, and no other is mentioned.

3. Compare this Scripture of the Inſtitution of Deacons, with the *qualifications* of Deacons, in 1 *Tim.* 3. and it will appear their work was to *ſerve Tables*. Ability, or *aptneſs to Teach*, is not mention'd among their Qualifications, as it is in thoſe of a *Biſhop*, or Presbyter, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. The Apoſtle mentions ſeveral Characters that are common to both, but diſtinguiſheth the *Biſhop* from the *Deacon* by this, that the Biſhop be διδακτικὸς, *apt to Teach*, which is not required in the *Deacons*; an evidence they are *Miniſters* not of the *Word*, but of *Tables*.

4. The Sixth General Council of *Conſtantinople*, acknowledges the Scripture-Deacons to be no more than **Overſeers** of the *Poor*.

Thus the Council: *Seeing the Book of the Acts*

Invenimus eos locutos esse non de viris qui miniſtrant Myſteriis, ſed de Miniſterio quod in uſu menſarum adhibeatur Sexta Syn. in Trullo, Can. 16. A. D. 692.

Acts mentions Seven Deacons Ordained by the *Apoſtles*, the Council of Neoceſarea determines there ought to be Seven in every Church; but we having adapted the Opinion of the Fathers to the *Apoſtles Expreſſions*, do find that they ſpeak not of thoſe who Miniſtred in the Sacred Myſteries, but of ſuch as Served at Tables. Thus *Chryſoſtom* expounded the place, as they add there.

This Teſtimony is the more conſiderable, as not only containing the Opinion of 166 Biſhops, who lived about the latter end of the Seventh Age, but affirming the Senſe of the *Fathers* of former Ages to be the ſame with theirs. By all which it appears, That Deacons originally were but *Overſeers* of the *Poor*. In future Ages the caſe was much altered, the Biſhops affected to be Guardians of the Poor, and to make the Deacons amends, admitted them to Baptize and Preach. The Biſhops omit Preaching, and become Servants of Tables, and the Deacons from ſerving of Tables, ſtep up into the Pulpit, and become Preachers.

5. About the middle of the Fifth Age they were permitted to read Homilies in the Church, but only in caſes of neceſſity, as when the Presbyter was diſabled by reaſon of ſome Infirmity*.

* *Conc. Vaſens. Can.* 4.

6. If the Ordination of Deacons as ſuch, made them *Miniſters of the Word and Sacraments*, as the *Rector* affirms, how comes the Church of *England* to Ordain them again, before

before they are compleat *Miniſters of the Sacrament?* What preſident have they in Scripture for this?

7. It's abſurd to ſay, That the Ordination of *Deacons* to *ſerve Tables*, made them alſo *Miniſters of the Word and Sacraments.* One individual Ordination to one and the ſame work, cannot confer two diſtinct Powers. They may as well ſay, the Ordination of a *Pariſh-Prieſt* makes him a *Dioceſan Biſhop.* But let us hear the Rector's Reaſons.

He thinks it's clear, they were Ordain'd not only to *ſerve Tables*, but to the *Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments.*

1. *Becauſe 'tis immediately noted* (ſaith he) *that the Word of God increaſed*, v. 7. P. 4.

But he conſidered not that this is rather to be imputed to the Apoſtles *giving themſelves continually to the Miniſtry of the Word and Prayer.*

Ver. 4. Having conſigned the Service of Tables to the Deacons, they attended the Miniſtry of the Word more conſtantly, and with leſs diſtraction; and then it follows, *the Word of God increaſed*, v. 7.

2. His next Reaſon is, *Stephen, one of them, did great wonders*, &c. *none were able to reſiſt the wiſdom by which he ſpake*, v. 8, 10. *Ibid.*

It's not ſaid that he Preached to the People, only that he diſputed in the Synagogue in defence of the Goſpel, which a private Man might do (*v.* 9.) 1 *Pet.* 3. 15.

3. His

3. His third Reaſon, *Philip, another of them, afterwards preached at Samaria*, ch. 8. He did not Preach at *Jeruſalem* but at *Samaria*, after he had left *Jeruſalem*, and ceaſed to exerciſe the Office of a *Deacon* there, *Acts* 8. 4, 5. He might be advanced to the Degree of an *Evangeliſt*, *Acts* 21. 8. If you find one that was a *Presbyter* half a Year ago, now exerciſing *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction*, will you ſay that a Presbyter, as ſuch, hath Epiſcopal Juriſdiction? *Philip* had ſerved Tables at *Jeruſalem*, and afterwards preaches at *Samaria*, does it follow that he preached as a *Deacon*, when Preaching was no part of the Office of a Deacon, as ſuch. Biſhop *Pearſon* confeſſeth he was an Evangeliſt at this time *.

*Lect. V. in Act. p. 66.

†*In tali circumſtantiâ evangelium prædicare, non diaconorum tantum ſed & privatorum. Grot. in Act. 8. 5.*

But ſuppoſe he had Preached at *Jeruſalem*, which does not appear, it was no more than what was uſually done by all gifted Perſons in thoſe extraordinary times.

Apollos, who was not perfectly Catechiſed in the Word of Chriſt, nor ſo much as Baptized with the Baptiſm of Chriſt, and therefore not Ordained by any Apoſtle, yet Preached, *Acts* 18. 24, 25.

* *Omnibus inter initia conceſſum eſt, Evangelizare, & baptizare, & ſcripturas in Eccleſia explanare. Hilar. in Eph.* 4.

Grotius acknowledges, that in thoſe times of Perſecution, private Perſons might preach, and he quotes to that purpoſe, *Acts* 11. 20. †

Hilarius, the Roman *Deacon*, goes higher, and ſaith, That at the firſt Planting of Chriſtianity, *all* were permitted to Preach, Baptize, and explain the Scriptures in the Congregation, 1 *Cor.* 14. 24. * *Origen*

Origen being perſecuted from *Alexandria*, Preached publickly at *Cæſarea*, upon the deſire of *Theoctiſtus*, Biſhop of the place, before he was Ordain'd.

When *Demetrius* of *Alexandria* cenſured the action as irregular, *Theoctiſtus* and *Alexander*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, Juſtified it, and produced ſeveral Examples of the ſame nature *.

A Lay-man is allowed to teach at the requeſt of the Clergy, in a Council of *Carthage*, held about the Year 436 †.

4. His fourth Reaſon, *Becauſe long after 'tis obſerved by Luke, that the reſt* (of the Seven, as I underſtand him) *preached the word in Phenice, Cyprus, and at Antioch*, &c. Acts 11. 19.

Luke ſaith οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες--*they which were ſcattered abroad, preached the Word.* The *Rector* makes bold to pervert the Text, and ſaith, *the reſt* (of the Seven) *Preach'd the Word*; and which is more unpardonable, he puts the Words in a different Character, as if they were the Words of *Luke*: He has no colour to foiſt his οἱ λοιποὶ, *the reſt*, into this Text, but it's apparently done upon deſign, to ſupport an *unſcriptural Hypotheſis.*

It's more pardonable to miſrepreſent a hundred Fathers, than to *alter one Text of the Sacred Scriptures.* He is a very bold Man that dare put Words in the Mouth of Inſpired Writers.

Luke refers to *Acts* 8. 1. *They were all ſcattered*

* *Niceph. Eccl. Hiſt.* V. 14.

† *Laicus præſentibus clerios niſi ipſis rogantibus docere non audeat.* Carth. Conc. IV. Can. 98. P. 4.

* *Pearſ. Annal. Paul.* p. 1. & *Lect.* IV. *in Act. Apoſt.* p. 63

ſcattered abroad, except the Apoſtles. Who were theſe All? Not the Six Deacons only *. What Senſe would it be to ſay, *All the Six Deacons* (for *Stephen* the Seventh was Martyred) *were ſcattered, except the Apoſtles? All were ſcattered.* That is, all the 120, which made up that Famous Council in *Acts* 1. 15. except the Apoſtles. † *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, who was none of the Seven Deacons, was one of thoſe that were ſcattered, *Acts* 11. 19, 20. and 13. 1.

† *Vid. Lightf. in loc.*

The *Rector* wou'd perſuade, they were only the Six Deacons *that were ſcattered*, of which *Philip* Preached in *Samaria*, and he has found *the reſt* in *Acts* 11. 19.

We have ſeen the invalidity of his Four Reaſons, to prove Deacons to be *Miniſters of the Word and Sacraments.*

P. 6. *He is apt to believe theſe Deacons were afterwards called Elders, as having power to Miniſter the Word and Sacrament, firſt mentioned* Acts 11. 30. *but it will not follow that they were equal with the Apoſtles.*

They that are ſo diſpos'd may take *Conjectures* for *Articles of Faith*, but we have prov'd the *Deacons* to be very different from *Presbyters*, and if the Church of *England* did not think them ſo, ſhe wou'd not Ordain them over again to make *Presbyters* of them.

Who ever affirm'd *Presbyters* to be equal with the *Apoſtles?* Dare he ſay Biſhops were equal with them?

Ordination

Ordination at leaſt muſt be excepted, ſaith the *Rector*. I always thought the Apoſtles excell'd Presbyters in far greater things than that of Ordination; but if you be ſo good natur'd as to allow the Rector, that the Apoſtles were ſuperiour to Presbyters *in point of Ordination*, and intruſted none but the Biſhops with it after their Deceaſe, he is even content that a Presbyter ſhould be equal with an Apoſtle in other reſpects.

Though Elders are firſt mention'd, *Acts* 11. 30. they were in being before; they are ſpoken of as the ordinary ſettled Governours of the Churches.

Mr. *G.* proceeds to prove, That *Presbyters could not Ordain, becauſe* Philip *the Deacon could not confer the Holy Ghoſt upon the believing Samaritans*; *the Apoſtles ſent* Peter *and* John, *who by Prayer, and laying on of Hands, confer'd the Holy Ghoſt upon them*, Acts 8. 12, 15, 17. *and thereby Ordain'd them. Therefore the Government of the Church, and Ordination, was lodg'd in the Apoſtles only, or as Supreme.* p. 7, 8.

1. He is not ſure *Ordination* was intended there; himſelf owns, That *ſome may, and with reaſon, believe it Confirmation.* So doth Dr. *Hammond*, and ſeveral others; and if we underſtand Confirmation by this miraculous Conferring of the Holy Ghoſt, his Argument is ſpoil'd. p. 7.

2. If Ordination was intended, it no more prejudices Presbyters Power of Ordaining,

than it doth that of the Biſhops, for neither can confer thoſe extraordinary Gifts.

3. All that had power of Ordination had not power of giving the Holy Ghoſt. *Evangeliſts* were truſted with the former, but not with the latter. *Timothy* and *Titus* Ordained, but did not give the Holy Ghoſt.

He fancies that *Simon Magus* deſired the Ordaining Power, *v.* 19. *Give me this Power.* *What Power*, ſaith the *Rector? Not Power to labour in the Word and Doctrine, and to adminiſter the Holy Sacraments.* Like enough, for *Simon Magus* as little cared for that, as ſome others who have poſſeſs'd themſelves of that Power he ſo much coveted. *What Power was it?* I doubt not but you'l expect ſome rare Diſcovery, having rais'd our Expectations to a great heighth, at length he reſolves the Queſtion, and tells us, it was *a Power of conferring that Power, i. e.* as he explains it, *That on whomſoever he laid his hands, he might be Ordained to the Miniſtry.* That is in plain terms, *he deſired to be made a Biſhop*, and to be intruſted with the *ordaining power*. I queſtion whether the Power then was ſo profitable as it has prov'd ſince; however, we are oblig'd to this Gentleman, for helping us to ſo clear a Notion of *Simony*.

P. 8.

III. He finds another Ordination in *Acts* 19. 17. *Where it is ſaid, That Ananias laid his hand upon Saul: this might be to Ordain him, for he laid his hands on him, not only that he might*

P. 8, 9.

might receive his ſight, but be alſo filled with the Holy Ghoſt. But I deſire the Reader to obſerve, that according to this Hypotheſis, *Saul* was *Ordained* before he was *Baptized.* He was Ordained, as he calls it, *v.* 17. and was Baptized after *Ananias* had laid his hands on him, *v.* 18. That is, he is firſt made an *Apoſtle*, then a *Chriſtian.*

He makes *Ananias but a private Believer* P. 9.
or Diſciple. His being call'd a *Diſciple*, *v.* 10. is no evidence of it; for the Apoſtles are ſo call'd, *Acts* 1. 15. How comes he to forget that *Dorotheus* calls him *a Biſhop of Damaſcus?* This would have ſomething help'd his Hypotheſis; ſeeing he was teſolv'd to have him *Ordained before he was Baptized*, e'en let it paſs for an *Epiſcopal Ordination.*

But that which ſpoils all is, *Paul* ſaith of himſelf that he was an *Apoſtle*, *not of Men, neither by Man, but by Jeſus Chriſt, and God the Father*, Gal. 1. 1.

IV. In the next place he conſiders the Ordination in *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. *Now there* P. 10.
were at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers, and the Holy Ghoſt ſaid unto them, Separate me Barnabas and Saul. J. O. Argued from this Inſtance, that Presbyters have Power to Ordain, for the Ordainers were Prophets and Teachers: now *Teachers* are ordinary Presbyters, who are diſtinguiſhed from Prophets, and other extraordinary Officers, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11. What

ſaith Mr. *G.* to this? even nothing to the purpoſe. *The Perſons here ſpoken of*, ſaith he, *were Teachers, that is, ordinary Miniſters, generally ſpeaking, but call'd* Prophets, *becauſe they received this ſpecial Command from Chriſt, to Ordain* Barnabas *and* Saul. *Ibid.*

1. He confounds *Prophets* and *Teachers*, which are diſtinguiſhed here, and in 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11. *Prophets* were extraordinary, *Teachers* ordinary Officers; this Gentleman, to ſerve a turn, makes them one and the ſame. If this be not to pervert the Scripture, I know not what is. *Luke* ſaith, *There were at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers:* That is, if we may believe the *Rector*, *Prophets and Prophets*, for the *Teachers were Prophets*, ſaith he.

2. The *Teachers are call'd Prophets*, ſaith he: They are ſo call'd by him, and not by the Holy Ghoſt.

3. They *are called Prophets, becauſe they received this ſpecial Command from Chriſt by the Holy Ghoſt*, as he thinks. How can he prove that the Holy Ghoſt did ſpeak by Immediate Revelation to the Teachers here? The Text ſpeaks nothing of it: It's moſt reaſonable to think he ſignify'd his Mind by one or more of the *Prophets* to the reſt of the Miniſters, then to fancy he advanced the *Teachers* into the order of *Prophets* for the time.

Dixit ſpiritus per Prophetas iſtos. Grot. in loc.

Had the *Revelation* been Communicated to all in Common, what needed the Evangeliſt

geliſt to have call'd the Ordainers *Prophets* and *Teachers?* It wou'd have been enough to call them *Prophets*. But there were both in *Antioch*, *Prophets* to whom the *Revelation* came, and *Teachers*, or ordinary Presbyters, who were included in the Command of ſeparating *Paul* and *Barnabas* for the Apoſtleſhip of the Gentiles.

This Ordination which was in favour of the Gentile World, was intended for a Preſident to the Gentile Churches in after Ages, as Learned Dr. *Lightfoot* obſerves *. * Vol. 1. P. 289.

This Inſtance of *Ordination by Presbyters* remains firm and unſhaken, and all that Mr. *G.* hath ſaid againſt it, ſerves only to diſcover the Strength of it

He undertakes to ſhew the difference between Apoſtles and Prophets, but not a Word of *difference between the Prophets and the Teachers*, that would have diſcovered the Fallacy of his Reaſonings.

He ſaith, *Apoſtles and Prophets had an extraordinary Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, yet with this difference; The Authority of the Apoſtles was fixt and habitual, their Character indelible, and their Office perpetual.* P. 10, 11.

I expected he would have ſaid an *infallible Aſſiſtance*, but it may be he intended that by *extraordinary*, though the following Words are a little inconſiſtent, and diveſt the Apoſtles of the extraordinary Aſſiſtance of the Spirit, except in ſome caſes.

The Apoſtles, ſaith he, *for the moſt part*, P. 11.

acted as it were according to their own diſcretion. What? without the Conduct of the Spirit?

The *Rector* ſhould have had the *diſcretion* to have conceal'd ſo dangerous a Poſition, which ſtrikes at the Foundations of our Faith.

This Principle naturally leads to *Deiſm* and *Irreligion.*

But worſe follows. *I ſuppoſe* (ſaith he) *in Matters of Importance, and in Doctrines Eſſential, guided by the Spirit.* I hope he does not mean as he ſpeaks. Does he but *Suppoſe* they were *guided by the Spirit?* Admit he means by *ſuppoſing*, his taking it for *granted*, then the meaning is, They were guided by the Spirit only in two Caſes.

1. *In Matters of Importance*, i. e. *in Practicals*, if I underſtand him. We conceive *Ibid.* all the Rules the holy Apoſtles left us about the *agenda* of Religion, were given by *Inſpiration*, and that all the *practical Duties* they recommend to us are *Matters of Importance*; to us they are ſo, what they are to this Gentleman, he knows beſt.

2. *He ſuppoſes they were guided by the Spirit in Doctrines Eſſential.*

1. It's well he aſcribes any of their Doctrines to the *Holy Spirit of God*; but why not all as well as ſome? The Spirit was promis'd them to *guide them into* **all** *Truth*, John 16. 13. Jeſus Chriſt ſaith, *The Spirit ſhould guide them into* all *Truth*: No, ſaith Mr. *G.* the Spirit guided them

them in *Doctrines Eſſential* only. Chriſt ſaith, The Holy Ghoſt *ſhall teach you* **all** *things*, *John* 14. 26. Mr. *G.* ſaith, Not **all** things, but *Matters of Importance*, and *Doctrines Eſſential* only.

Doubtleſs the Lord Jeſus was as good as his Word, and gave the Infallible Aſſiſtance of his Spirit to the Bleſſed Apoſtles in all Points of Faith and Practice they recommend to us, though Mr. *G.* doth not believe it. His *Unbelief cannot make the Faith of God without effect; let God be true, and every man a liar.* *Rom.* 3. 3. 4

2. According to his *wretched ſuppoſition* the holy Apoſtles might be miſtaken in *Doctrines not Eſſential*, for they had not the Aſſiſtances of the Spirit, as he ſuggeſts: And if they might be miſtaken, who knows but they were miſtaken, and might obtrude Errors inſtead of Truth upon the World? And if ſo, how can it be prov'd to be our Duty to believe thoſe *Doctrines not Eſſential?* But, thanks be to God, we have a *ſure word of promiſe*, and conſequently a *ſure rule* of *Faith* and *Practice*, whatever the *Rector* inſinuates to the contrary, in favour of *Atheiſtical* Spirits.

3. The Learned are not agreed about the Number of *Doctrines Eſſential*; thoſe are Doctrines Eſſential to Chriſtianity with ſome, that are but *Integrals* (if I may ſo ſay) with others. All Proteſtants are agreed that Eſſential Doctrines are but few; ſo that moſt of the Doctrines of Chriſti-

anity are but *diſcretionary Opinions*, and no *Dictates of the Holy Ghoſt*, with this Man. Tell it not in *Gath*, leſt the *uncircumciſed* rejoice.

4. Admit the Creed (call'd the *Apoſtles*) be a Summary of *Eſſential Doctrines*, it does not expreſly aſſert the Divinity of Chriſt, and of the Holy Ghoſt, and therefore the *Socinians* can freely Subſcribe it. Will the *Rector* ſay the *Divinity of Chriſt*, and the *Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt* are *Doctrines not Eſſential*, and conſequently not delivered by the Spirit of God?

5. Is the *Superiority of Biſhops* an *Eſſential Doctrine?* If it be, they are no *Chriſtians* who do not believe it, for they reject an Eſſential Doctrine of Chriſtianity: But no Sober Proteſtant will affirm it, for this were to damn all the *Foreign Reformed Churches*, who believe it not: If it be no *Eſſential Doctrine*, as certainly it is not, we are left to our liberty, whether we will believe it or not, for the Apoſtles were not guided by the Spirit in delivering it, according to Mr. *G*'s. *Hypotheſis*.

He proceeds to deſcribe the Prophets. *Their Power* (ſaith he) *was not conſtant, they*
P. 11. *ſpake only as the Spirit mov'd, which if he ceas'd to do, they were no longer Prophets. Thus the Teachers at* Antioch (*ordinary Miniſters, and under the Apoſtles, yet*) *being moved by the Holy Ghoſt, became Prophets, and Ordained* Barnabas *and* Saul. Here he miſtakes alſo: 1. In

1. In making the Prophets to be only ſuch while they were actually Inſpired. There were Prophets by *Office*, and they are ſo called, when the Spirit of Prophecy did not actually move them, 2 *Kings* 3. 11, 15. 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 32. Their Power was conſtant, though the Exerciſe of it was not ſo. *Nathan* is call'd a *Prophet*, when the Spirit of Prophecy was not actually upon him, 2 *Sam.* 7. 2, 3.

2. All *Inſpirations* by the Holy Ghoſt do not make a *Prophet*. *Balaam* and *Caiaphas* were Inſpired, but no Divine Prophets. *Ananias* was mov'd by the Holy Ghoſt to lay his Hands on *Paul*, for recovering of his ſight, but it does not appear that he was a Prophet; he is no where ſo call'd. God's ſpeaking to him in a Viſion, doth not make him a Prophet, as Mr. *G.* fancies, for ſo he did to *Cornelius*, who was ſo far from being a Prophet, that at that time he was not a Chriſtian, *Acts* 10. 3, 4.

Admit the *Ordinary Miniſters* at *Antioch* were inwardly mov'd by the Holy Ghoſt, to Ordain *Paul* and *Barnabas*, which is not ſaid in the Text, that doth not make them Prophets. For *Luke* diſtinguiſheth between the *Prophets* and the *Teachers*, though Mr. *G.* deſignedly confounds them. Nor doth a particular direction of the Holy Ghoſt conſtitute *Prophets*, as appears in *Ananias*, a *Diſciple*, (and it may be a *Teacher*) and in *Cornelius*, neither *Diſciple*, nor *Teacher*.

3. He

3. He calls the Teachers at *Antioch*, *Ordinary Miniſters*, and yet ſaith they were Prophets, that is, *extraordinary Miniſters*, for himſelf owns Prophets to be *extraordinary Officers*. One would think, if they were *ordinary Miniſters*, they were not *extraordinary*: If *extraordinary*, they were not *ordinary*. I leave it to him *that can* to reconcile theſe Contradictions.

p. 12. V. His next Inſtance of Ordination is from *Acts* 14. 23. *The Ordinations mention'd there, were by Apoſtles and not by Presbyters*, as he ſaith.

This Inſtance makes as little for him as the former, becauſe

1. There was good Reaſon why the *Apoſtles* alone ſhou'd ordain Presbyters in Churches that had no Miniſters in them, until the Apoſtles had conſtituted them. Presbyters cou'd not ordain before they were in being.

He is aware of this Reaſon, and allows theſe Churches had no Presbyters in them

p. 13. at this Time; *But this*, ſaith he, *was not the Reaſon, for then* Philip *wou'd have laid Hands on thoſe that were Ordain'd at* Samaria. The Inſtance of *Philip* we conſidered before. If he were a *Deacon*, as he affirms, all will own he had no Power of Ordination: If an *Evangeliſt*, as it ſhould ſeem from *Acts* 21. 8. all will own, *Evangeliſts* might Ordain: But they cou'd not give the *extraordinary Gift* of the Holy Spirit, which was given by the Apoſtles. 2. The

2. The Apoſtles made Elders in every Church with the Suffrages of the People. So χειροτονήσαντες (which we render, *Ordain'd*, Acts 14. 23.) ſignifies, *The Multitude of Believers* choſe the *Deacons* (whom Mr. *G.* wou'd have to be the ſame with theſe *Elders*) before the Apoſtles Ordain'd them: And ſo they did the two Candidates for the Apoſtleſhip, *Acts* 1. Mr. *G.* allows this Power of the People: Now if theſe *Ordinations be preſidents unto us*, as he takes them to be, they are but ill follow'd by our *Epiſcopal Ordainers*, for the Election of the People ſeldom precedes their Ordinations.

* *Significat hos ſuffragiis electos eſſe.* Erasmus *in* loc.

3. *They Ordain'd Elders in every Church*, not one, but many, and why not *Biſhops* alſo, if they had been neceſſary? 'Tis evident there were none at this Time. The Apoſtles left the Churches under the Care of theſe Elders, without Superiour Biſhops. It will be ſaid, theſe *Elders* were ſubject to the Apoſtles: And were not the Biſhops ſubject to the Apoſtles alſo? I hope none will ſay they were *equal* to them.

How come the Apoſtles not to Ordain a *Biſhop* in every Church, when they themſelves made but a ſhort ſtay with them? They cou'd not perſonally overſee them all, and if Biſhops had been neceſſary in their abſence, doubtleſs they wou'd have appointed them. Acts 14. 23, 24.

It will be ſaid, *they intended to return to viſit*

visit them again, but when they they took their last leave of them, then they appointed Bishops for their Successors.

This is notoriously false, for the Apostle *Paul* commits the Church of *Ephesus*, to the Government of the Presbyters there, when he took his last leave of them, intending to see them no more, whether he did see them again or no, is nothing to the purpose, for 'tis certain he thought he shou'd see them no more: How comes he then not to leave a Superiour Bishop over the Presbyters of *Ephesus*, for his Successor, when he was taking his final leave of them? No one Instance can be given in all the New Testament of the Apostles ordaining a single Person to succeed them as a fixed Officer in the Government of any one Church, when they took their last leave of it.

Acts 20. 17, 25, 28.

When the Apostle left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, he intended to come again, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. when *Titus* had ordain'd Elders in *Crete*, to govern the Churches there, the Apostle calls him away, *Tit.* 3. 12.

His next Act of Church Government, which he finds in *Acts* 15. we have considered before. None that I know of have argued for Presbyters ordaining from this place, as he imagines they might.

p. 13.

He grants that *Elders have a share in the Deliberative and Legislative Part of Church-Government*: But seems loath to trust them with

p. 14.

with the *Executive Power*: He gives them the greater, and more difficult part of Church-Government, *viz.* a Power of making Laws, and denies them the easier and less honourable Power of executing those Laws.

He observes, *The Elders were subordinate to the Apostles*: Who ever denied it? And so were *Timothy* and *Titus* his supposed Bishops. p. 15.

The Epistles *written* to them are convincing Evidences of their *Subordination to* Paul, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. and 4. 16. and 6. 13, 14. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 9, 13. He *charges him*, orders him to *bring his Cloak*, and personally to *attend* him.

So he enjoins *Titus* to attend him, *Titus* 3. 12. His Epistles to both are in a stile at least equally Authoritative with that which Bishops use in their Pastoral Letters to their Clergy: And therefore all the Reasonings of Mr. *G.* from the *Subordination of Presbyters to the Apostles*, are impertinent, for *Timothy* and *Titus* whom he calls *Bishops*, were subordinate to the Apostles. So that if Presbyters had no Power of Government, no more had Bishops, for these were under the Apostles also.

He saith, *James was not the Apostle, but Brother of Christ*. *Paul* reckons him among the Apostles. *Gal.* 1. 19. *Other of the Apostles saw I none, save* James *the Lord's Brother*. Bishop *Pearson* observes, that p. 16.

the

the Opinion that makes him no Apoſtle, took riſe from the *Fictitious Writings* of *Clemens*, Lect. *in* Act. Apoſt *p.* 58.

p. 17. VI. He finds an Ordination in *Acts* 19. 6, 7. *In which* Paul *only laid his Hands on twelve Perſons at* Epheſus, *and not* Timothy *and* Eraſtus *who were with* Paul *at this Time*, Acts 19. 22.

1. It is not ſaid that *Timothy* and *Eraſtus* were with *Paul*, when he laid his Hands on thoſe twelve Men: *Acts* 19. 22. doth not prove it, for it ſpeaks of *Paul*'s ſending them to *Macedonia*, which was about two Years after, *Acts* 19. 10, 21, 22.

2. But ſuppoſe they were, *Paul* laid Hands on thoſe twelve Men *to confer the gift of the Holy Ghoſt* on them, which *Timothy* and *Eraſtus* could not do. This Power was peculiar to the Apoſtles, we do not read that any *Prophets* or *Evangeliſts* were ever entruſted with this Power *, much leſs were *ordinary Officers*. The Caſe of *Ananias* was ſingular, and depended on a particular Revelation, which is an Evidence that the Power of giving the Holy Ghoſt was not inherent in him, as in the Apoſtles, *Acts* 9. 17.

Act. 19. 6.
Act. 8. 17.
Pearſ. Lect. V. *in* Act. *p.* 68.

3. If there be any force in this Argument, it excludes *Biſhops* as well as *Presbyters* from the Power of Ordination, for neither of them *cou'd* nor *can* confer the *extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt*, which were given by the Apoſtles Hands.

VII. He

VII. He thinks that the *Corinthian Elders had no Power of Excommunication:* Paul *decreed it*, ſaith he, *and commanded them to Confirm and Publiſh it*, 1 Cor. 5. 3, 4, 5. P. 17.

1. If they had no Power, why doth the Apoſtle reprove them for not doing it? 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. and enjoyn them to avoid diſorderly Walkers, *ver.* 13. and to *Judge them that are within*, ver. 14. To *Judge* is to *Decree*, as the Rector expounds it in *v.* 3. So that according to his own Interpretation, the Elders had Power to *Decree an Excommunication*. He fancies the Apoſtle to be a ſort of *Lay-Chancellour*, and the *Corinthian Elders* to be like the Presbyters of the Church of *England*, who have the Priviledge of Publiſhing the Excommunicating Decrees of the Chancellour.

2. He alters and perverts the *ſacred Text*, for thus he renders and explains it, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. *I verily, as abſent in Body, but preſent in Spirit, have judged* (have Decreed) *as tho I were preſent* (perſonally) *concerning him that hath ſo done this Deed: In the Name* (or Authority) *of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when ye are gather'd together and of my Spirit* (that is, by my Authority) *with the Power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to deliver ſuch an one to Satan.* Ibid.

The *Engliſh* Tranſlation, according to the Original, renders it, *When ye are gathered together, and my Spirit*, he renders it, *of my Spirit*, as if the Conſtruction were *in*

in the Name of my Spirit, that is, *by my Authority* *; intimating that the whole Authority of excommunicating the Inceſtuous Perſon had been in *Paul* and none in the Church.

* συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος.

The *Syriac* which is very Ancient, renders it, *That ye all gather together, and I with you in Spirit, with the Power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* So doth the Ancient *Latin* Verſion expreſs it *. Thus the Rector diſturbs the Order of the Text, contradicts the moſt approved Verſions, both Ancient and Modern, to ſerve a Deſign. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of the *Preſence of his Spirit*, joyning with, and going before the *Corinthian Elders*, but doth not aſſume the ſole Power to himſelf. He enjoyns them by his *Apoſtolical Authority* to do their Duty, and allows them to *Judge thoſe within*, 1 Cor. 5. 12. In like manner he enjoyns ſeveral things to *Timothy* and *Titus*.

* *Congregatis vobis & meo ſpiritu.*

p. 17. The *ſame Apoſtle* (ſaith Mr. *G.*) *excommunicated* Hymeneus *and* Alexander, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. *No Elder joyning with him.*

He cannot prove there were any Elders in *Epheſus*, when *Paul* excommunicated theſe two Men; or if there were any, that they did not joyn with him, But ſuppoſe the Apoſtle did Excommunicate them by his eminent Apoſtolical Authority, and deliver them to Satan to be tormented by him (which ſome think he did) I ſee not what Advantage he can make of it, except he could

could prove, *That Biſhops are endued with the ſame miraculous Power.*

VIII. He comes at length to *Timothy*'s Ordination, here he Notes from 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *That* Timothy *was ordain'd by* Paul *without Elders mention'd. This Scripture*, he ſaith, *the* Presbyterians *ſeldom take notice of, and Mr.* Pryn *paſſes it over in ſilence.* p. 18.

Mr. *Pryn* doth mention it *, and allows that *Paul* laid on his Hands in Conjunction with the Presbytery. The *Rector* being unprovided with better Matter, fills part of two Pages with an Invective againſt Mr. *Pryn, for paſſing over this*, 2 Tim. 1. 6. *in Silence*, by this the Reader may ſee what Credit is to be given to this Gentleman's Accuſations.

* *The unbiſh. of* Timothy *and* Titus. *p.* 76. Edit. 1660.

J. O. alſo hath conſider'd this Scripture in his Plea, *p.* 46. and ſaith, 'That *Pauls* 'laying on of Hands upon *Timothy* might 'be, for ought appears to the contrary, for 'the conferring the Holy Ghoſt, which was 'given by the laying on of the Apoſtles 'Hands, *Acts* 8. 17, 18. but if he laid 'Hands for Ordination, its certain he join'd 'the Presbyters with him, which he had 'not done, if their had not been an inherent 'Power of Ordination in Presbyters as ſuch.

He promiſes *to ſhew, that* 1 Tim. 4. 14. *makes little or nothing for Presbyterian Ordination, and to reconcile it with their's and it's Parallel*, 2 Tim. 1. 6. p. 19.

It is a Favour that he allows the 1 *Tim.*

4. 14. to make a *little* for Ordination by Presbyters, but he is not ſure whether it makes *little* or *nothing* for us. This Gentleman is ſo Tenacious, that where he yields an *Inch*, you may reckon an *Ell* is due.

The Words are theſe, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* This is a clear Inſtance, as we think, for Ordination by Presbyters. No, ſaith the Rector, *it makes little or nothing for it.* But let's hear his Proof.

He has four things to offer, which if they fail him, our Inſtance holds good.

P. 20. I. *It's no doubt with him but that* Timothy *was Ordained twice, firſt a Presbyter*, by Prophecy with the Presbytery, *and then a Biſhop by* Paul. How will he prove this? Why, *Paul was Ordain'd twice, firſt a Miniſter of the Word in ordinary, then unto the Apoſtleſhip of the Gentiles.*

1. His Proof wants another. Was the *Apoſtle Paul* but an *ordinary Miniſter* at firſt? Who was *called not of men, neither by man, but by Jeſus Chriſt*, Gal. 1. 1. who was caught up into the Third Heaven, 2 *Cor.* 12. 2. and had abundance of Revelations, *v.* 7. who ſaw the Lord Jeſus, and reckons himſelf one of the Apoſtles from the time of his miraculous Converſion, 1 *Cor.* 15. 8, 9. *Gal.* 1. 15, 16, 17. *Neither went I up to Jeruſalem* (he ſpeaks of the time immediately following his Converſion) *to them which were Apoſtles before*

before me. This implies he was an Apoſtle himſelf at that time *. * *Pearſ. Ann. Paul.* P. 2.

Was he but an *ordinary Miniſter* who had the *extraordinary Gifts* of the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* 9. 17. He that has the Confidence to make one of the *chief Apoſtles* an ordinary Miniſter, may with equal aſſurance aſſert every ordinary Miniſter to be a chief Apoſtle.

St. *Paul* expreſly ſaith, That he was *not taught his Goſpel by Men, but by the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt*, Gal. 1. 12. Was he but an *ordinary Miniſter* who receiv'd his Goſpel by *extraordinary Revelation?* Biſhop *Pearſon*'s Judgment, which is follow'd by the Rector in his Annals, I preſume is of ſome value with him. The Biſhop will ſet him at rights: he owns *Paul* to be an Apoſtle, before the Miſſion mention'd in *Acts* 13.1,2. This he doth both in his *Annals*, p. 2. and in his *Lection in Act. Apoſt.* p. 74, 75. So doth *Euſebius*, *Eccl. Hiſt.* II. 1.

2. He was ſent by Revelation unto the Gentiles, before the Ordination mention'd in *Acts* 13. as appears *Acts* 22. 18. 21. The Ordination mention'd there did not make him an Apoſtle, as the *Rector* dreams, but he had an antecedent immediate Call from Jeſus Chriſt.

The Holy Ghoſt thought fit he ſhould enter upon the Stated Exerciſe of his Apoſtolical Miniſtry amongſt the Gentiles, at the Door of Ordination by Presbyters, for

a Preſident of Ordination to the Gentile Churches. When the great Apoſtle of the Gentiles enters at this Door, it's fit that ordinary Miniſters ſhou'd; and if Presbyters may lay hands on an Apoſtle, much more on inferiour Miniſters.

3. He allows that *Timothy* was made a *Presbyter by Presbyters*, but that he was made a Biſhop by *Paul*, is barely Aſſerted and not Proved.

II. He examines the meaning of προφητείας,
P. 21. *Prophecy*. If *Timothy* was Ordain'd *but once*, then, ſaith he, *by Prophecy*, ſignifies *by Prophets, the Abſtract for the Concrete, and theſe Prophets were* Paul *and* Silas.

I add (ſaith he) *the Presbytery here mention'd, or Presbyters themſelves, might have*
P. 22. *been* Prophets *too, and Ordained* Timothy *according to Prophecy.*

1. Lets ſee how the Words run with this Explication, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophets, with the laying on of the Hands of the Prophets.* Profound Sence! He is reſolved to make *Apoſtles* or *Prophets* of all that are concern'd in Ordination, but the miſchief on't is, the Biſhops whoſe Cauſe he pleads, are neither one nor t'other.

Prophecy with him ſignifies *Prophets*, and the *Presbyters* were *Prophets*, ſo that *Timothy* was Ordain'd *by Prophets with Prophets.* The *Rector* has highly obliged the Learned World by this Famous Commentary. If

you

you ſhou'd ask why he *degrades* Paul *an Apoſtle*, into an *inferiour* Order of *Prophets*, I hope it will ſatisfie you, that he hath made amends by *exalting* inferiour Presbyters, into a *ſuperiour Order* of Prophets. One while *Paul* is an *ordinary Miniſter* with him, another while *a Prophet*, and ſometimes he is content, provided he do not ſtand in the way of his beloved Epiſcopacy, he ſhould be an *Apoſtle*.

2. The Truth is, *by Prophecy* reſpects the *Prophecies that went before of* Timothy, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. It ſeems they were many, if we reſpect the Perſons Prophecying, and therefore call'd *Prophecies*, and but one if we conſider the thing Prophecied, and therefore call'd *Prophecy* *. The Text doth not ſay who theſe Prophets were, but the *Rector*, a Man of happy Invention, hath found them out, and aſſures us they were *Paul* and *Silas*.

* *Eſt. in* 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.

III. He lets us ſee what we are to underſtand by *Presbytery*. *'Tis a Word borrow'd* (ſaith he) *from the Jewiſh Church.* P. 23. *Moſes took the heads of the twelve Tribes to be aſſiſtant to him in the Government; unto theſe anſwer'd the Twelve Apoſtles: but at length God commanded him to chooſe Seventy Elders of the People*, Num. 11. 16. It is worth our Remark here.

1. That he made Chriſt and the twelve Apoſtles to anſwer unto the High Prieſt, and the inferiour Prieſts, *p.* 1, 2. And he

told us, it was *manifeſt* it was ſo, *p.* 2. but now by a *new Manifeſtation*, he tells us the Twelve Apoſtles anſwer'd the *Heads of the Twelve Tribes.*

2. Where doth he find that *Moſes took the Heads of the Twelve Tribes, to be his Aſſiſtants in the Government*, before the Seventy Elders were choſen. *Moſes* himſelf gives a different Account: he ſaith, he judged the People alone, until *Jethro*, his Father in Law, adviſed him to joyn others with him in the Government; and that thereupon he choſe, not Twelve Heads of the ſeveral Tribes, but *Rulers of Thouſands, Rulers of Hundreds, of Fifties, and of Tens*, Ex. 18. 13, 25. *Deut.* 1. 15. That there were *Heads of the Twelve Tribes* every body knows, but that theſe were choſen excluſive of others, to be *Moſes his Aſſiſtants in the Government*, is a *new diſcovery*, which no body knew before. We will not envy the *Rector* the Honour of being the firſt Diſcoverer of this *Cabbala.*

3. The Seventy Elders of the People, to whom the *Presbytery* anſwereth, were choſen (as himſelf confeſſeth) *to be Aſſiſtants to* Moſes *in the Government.*

This inſtance of his own producing, evinceth that Presbyters have *Power of Government.* The Jewiſh *Sanhedrin* was the Supream Court of Judicature among the Jews, and were entruſted with the Power of *Ordaining Elders.*

At

At firſt, *every one that was regularly Ordain'd himſelf*, had the Power of Ordaining his Diſciples; but in the time of *Hillel*, it was reſolved that none might Ordain, without the preſence of the *Naſi*, or Preſident of the *Sanhedrin*, or a Licenſe from him *. * *Seld. de Syned.* II. 7. § 1.

If the *Presbytery* anſwereth the *Sanhedrin*, as the *Rector* confeſſeth it doth, the Power of Government, and particularly of Ordination belongeth unto it.

He ſaith *the Jews call'd that Celebrated Council in their own Language, the* Sanedrim, *but the N. T. and the Greek Tongue* πρεσβυτέριον, *or* συνέδριον. He ſeems to make *Sanhedrin* (ſo the Jews write it סנהדרין, and not *Sanedrin*, as he doth) a *Hebrew Word*, whereas it is the Corruption of συνέδριον, in a Hebrew Dialect. I mention this only by the by, to give the Reader a taſte of the Learned *Rector*'s Skill in *Philology*. P. 24.

He adds, *That Moſes was Head, and a part of his Council of Seventy; yea, that Chriſt Himſelf, who was alſo a Prophet like unto* Moſes, *had Twelve Apoſtles, and Seventy Diſciples, who made up a Presbytery.* Ibid.

1. In *Acts* 22. 30. the συνέδριον is expreſly diſtinguiſh'd from the ἀρχιερεῖς, as the τὸ πρεσβυτέριον is, *v.* 5.

2. *Moſes* was a Type of Chriſt, and as he was Head of the Council of Seventy, ſo is Chriſt of the Presbytery. It is improperly ſaid that *Moſes* was part of the Seventy, for there were Seventy, or Seventy Two, beſides *Moſes*.

3. The Seventy Diſciples anſwer'd the Jewiſh Presbytery with him above, but now finding he had yielded too much, he Corrects himſelf, and makes the Twelve Apoſtles part of Chriſt's *Presbytery*, as he calls it; but the N. T. no where calls them ſo, nor doth it appear that ever the Twelve Apoſtles, and Seventy Diſciples, acted together as one *Presbytery*.

P. 25. *Ignatius* (ſaith he) *ſtiles them* πρεσβυτέριον ἐκκλησίας, *the Presbytery of the Church.*

Ignatius calls the *Apoſtles* ſo (not the Apoſtles and Seventy Diſciples, as he inſinuates) in a general Senſe, as they call themſelves *Presbyters*. But the New Teſtament ſufficiently diſtinguiſheth between *Apoſtles* and *Presbyters* properly ſo call'd, but no where diſtinguiſheth between *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*.

So likewiſe, if we may believe the *Rector*,

Ibid. *every Apoſtle in his Plantation, had his Presbytery in the Cities where he had ſettled Churches, as is clear from* Acts 15. *but that Apoſtle was head of them.*

1. Doubtleſs every Conſtituted Church had a *Presbytery*, which was the *Church's Presbytery*, and not the *Apoſtles*, as he calls it. *His* Presbytery is a Form of Expreſſion not known in the New Teſtament. *Paul* doth not call the Presbytery of any Church *his Presbytery*.

2. What if two Apoſtles ſettled a Church in Conjunction, as *Paul* and *Barnabas* did many;

many; whose then was the Presbytery? was it divided between both? or were they *joint heads* of the Presbytery? or did one resign his right in them to another? Perhaps Mr. *G.* can tell us how the Point was settled, without the danger of making *two Apostolical Heads of the Presbytery of a Church*, for that would be a bad President, and might warrant the setting up of *Two Bishops* in one Church.

3. The Elders of *Jerusalem* had not *one Apostle*, but Apostles Superiour to them, *Acts* 15. 2. and so were *Prophets* and *Evangelists*. But we do not find that they were under the Inspection of one Apostle, Prophet, or Evangelist, more than another, but Subject to all, and willing to be guided by them, as there was occasion.

4. Were not the *Apostles* Heads of the Bishops also? This we have proved already. The Superiority of the Apostles over the *Presbyters*, doth not in the least diminish their Power as such; it was fit they should act under the Inspection of the Apostles, who were Infallibly Assisted by the Holy Ghost.

After a great deal of needless labour to himself and Reader, at length he *grants*, That *Timothy was Ordain'd by the Presbytery, of which* Paul *was the principal Head* P. 25.

Here you have his own Confession, That *Timothy was Ordain'd by the Presbytery.* Truth is great, and will one time or other extort

extort Self-condemning Teſtimonies out of the Mouths of Adverſaries. But he adds, That *Paul was the principal Head of this Presbytery.*

Head is an Ambiguous Word: If he means by it *Supreme Governour*, it belongs properly to *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is the *Head of the Church*, and *Head over all things to it*, *Eph.* 1. 22. & 5. 23. No Apoſtle is ever call'd *Head*, much leſs *principal Head*, either of the Church or of the Presbytery, in all the *N. Teſtament*. It's a Title the Pope of *Rome* affects.

If he means a *ſubordinate Governour*, as I preſume he doth, he was no more the *Head of this Presbytery*, than of all other Presbyteries, not only in Churches Planted by him, but in all others to whom the Spirit guided him. His Power was the ſame in *Rome* and *Coloſs*, where he found Churches Eſtabliſhed by others, as in *Epheſus* or *Corinth*, where he ſettled Churches himſelf.

If the Apoſtle join'd the Presbytery with him in Ordination, as the *Rector* confeſſeth he did, it is ſufficient to demonſtrate, *That Presbyters have an inherent Power of Ordaining.*

The Apoſtle's being Preſident of the Presbytery, makes no more for Biſhops, than it doth for Presbyters, for neither of them pretend to Succeed the Apoſtles in the extent of Apoſtolical Power; and all Presbyteries have a Moderator, or Preſident, for Order's ſake.

Upon

Upon the whole Matter, it's clear to me, (ſaith Mr. *G.*) *That the Presbytery ſpoken of,* 1 Tim. 4. 14. *includes the Apoſtle* Paul. P. 27.

1. He told us before, that *Paul* was included in the Words *by Prophecy*, now he includes him in the *Presbytery*: Let us ſee what Senſe this Interpretation makes. —— *The gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy*; i. e. Paul *and* Silas, *with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*; i. e. of *Paul*, and ordinary Miniſters. The Gift, according to this Interpretation, was given by the laying on of the Hands of *Paul*, *with* the laying on of the Hands of *Paul*: *riſum teneatis?*

2. The Apoſtles are diſtinguiſhed from the Presbytery, *Acts* 15. 23.

IV. The Fourth thing he hath undertaken is to conſider *Paul*'s διὰ προφητείας, μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν--- *By Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery.* Hence he infers, That *Timothy was properly Ordain'd by Prophets, in the preſence, or witneſs, and with the conſent of the Presbyters.* P. 28.

1. *J. O.* Prov'd in his Plea, *p.* 47, 48. that διὰ and μετὰ are uſed promiſcuouſly in the *N. T.* which Mr. *G.* takes no notice of.

2. Himſelf applies μετὰ as well as διὰ, to *Paul*, by affirming that he is included in the Presbytery.

3. He forgot himſelf in ſaying, That *Timothy was properly Ordain'd by Prophets*, for he own'd, *p.* 25. *That he was Ordain'd by the*

the Presbytery. Truth is one and the same, but Error is inconsistent with it self.

4. The laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery signifies more than their *presence*, *witness*, and *consent*, for the presence, witness and consent of the People was requisite, as he confesseth, but they never laid on Hands in Ordination.

5. He makes *Paul one of the Presbytery*; the laying on of his Hands, according to this Hypothesis, signify'd no more than his *Presence* and *Consent*. Thus in denying *Ordination* by Presbyters, he destroys *Apostolical Ordination*, and consequently that which is *Episcopal*.

He Flurts at the Learned and Judicious Dr. *Owen*, whose Name will live in the Church of God, when such Men as he are written in the Dust. He disingeniously
P. 29. makes the Dr. to say, *That we are Justify'd by Faith with good Works; that Faith is the Instrument whereby Justification is convey'd, and good Works wherewith it is conferr'd.*

He shou'd have shew'd the place where Dr. *Owen* saith so, but this he cou'd not do. The Words are his own, and easily betray the Author, though he wou'd fain father them upon the Doctor. Dr. *Owen* saith, according to the Scriptures, *That we are Justify'd by Faith* without *Works*; the Rector makes him to say, *we are Justify'd by Faith* with *Works*.

In the next Lines he contradicts himself, and

and explains the Drs. *with Works*, by *without Works*; for he affirms, *That the Presbyters contributed no more unto Ordination, than good Works in the Drs. Opinion, do unto Juſtification, that is, nothing at all.*

1. He told us once, That the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery ſignified *Ordination*, P. 25. afterward it ſignified only *Conſent*, P. 28. and here it ſignifies *nothing at all.* We muſt crave the help of his *Learned Neighbour*, who communicated a Quotation in *J. O*'s. Book to him, to reconcile him to himſelf.

2. It ſeems good Works contribute ſomething to our Juſtification in the Rector's Opinion; he declares himſelf fully of that Opinion in the next Paragraph, and ſaith, *He is ſo far of the Drs. mind, that in Juſtification Faith is the firſt and chief Inſtrument of Conveyance.* This implies, That good Works are a ſecondary and ſubordinate Cauſe of Juſtification.

I will put this Gentleman in mind of a Paſſage or two in the Book of *Homilies*. 'St. *Paul* declareth nothing here upon the 'behalf of Man concerning his Juſtification, '*but only a true and lively Faith*: And yet 'that Faith doth not ſhut out Repentance, 'Hope, Love, Dread and the Fear of God, 'to be joyned with Faith in every Man 'that is Juſtify'd, *but it ſhutteth them out* '*from the office of Juſtifying*; ſo that altho' 'they be all preſent together in him that

'is

* *Serm. of Salvat. Part* 1. p. 13. *Edit.* 1673.
† P. 15. *Ib.*

'is Juſtify'd, yet *they Juſtifie not all together**.

In the Second Part of the ſame *Homily* † we have this remarkable Paſſage: 'This 'Faith the Holy Scripture teacheth us, this 'is the ſtrong Rock and Foundation of 'Chriſtian Religion, this Doctrine all old 'and ancient Authors of Chriſt's Church 'do approve; this Doctrine advanceth and 'ſetteth forth the true Glory of Chriſt, and 'beateth down the vain glory of Man: 'This whoſoever denieth, is not to be ac-'counted a Chriſtian Man, nor for a ſet-'ter forth of Chriſt's Glory, but for an Ad-'verſary to Chriſt and his Goſpel.

Note here,

1. That the Doctrine which the *Rector* ridicules in Dr. *Owen*, is the *Orthodox Doctrine of the Church of* England, and of all *ancient Authors* of Chriſt's Church.

2. That whoſoever joyns Works with Faith, in the Act of Juſtifying, is *an Adverſary to Chriſt, and his Goſpel. and not to be reputed for a Chriſtian.*

Either the Rector hath ſubſcribed the *Book of Homilies*, or he hath not; *If he hath not*, he hath no Legal Right to his Benefice, being not duly qualify'd according to the Statute, which requires all Eccleſiaſtical Perſons to Subſcribe the XXXIX Articles (on pain of Deprivation) whereof the XXXV Article declares, That the *Book of Homilies doth contain a godly and wholſome Doctrine, and neceſſary for theſe times.* The

ſame

ſame Subſcription is required by the *Canon* in this Form; *Can.* 36. *I* N. N. *do willingly*, & ex animo, *Subſcribe to theſe Three Articles above mention'd, and to all things that are contain'd in them.* The Third Article in the Canon reſpects the XXXIX Articles of Religion, which the Subſcriber is to *acknowledge to be all agreeable to the Word of God.*

If he hath Subſcribed the *Articles*, and conſequently the *Book of Homilies*, he hath Subſcribed to the Sentence of his own *Condemnation*, viz. That he *who joyns Works with Faith, in the Office of Juſtifying, is an Adverſary to Chriſt, and his Goſpel, and not to be reputed for a Chriſtian.*

He that is ſo liberal in paſſing Sentence on his Neighbours *as no true Miniſters*, ſhou'd review the Sentence he has paſſed upon himſelf, *as no true Chriſtian*, while he corrupts the Foundation-Doctrine of Juſtification.

Thus I have vindicated 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. from the weak and Self-contradicting Exceptions of the Rector. The reſt of this *Chapter* is only a *recapitulation* of his long perplex'd Commentary upon that plain Text.

He refers 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. where the Elders are exhorted ποιμαίνειν and ἐπισκοπεῖν, to *Feed the Flock, and to take the over-ſight of it*, P. 37. to *an Appendix* by it ſelf, becauſe he knows not in what order of Time to place it.

Let it be imagin'd (ſaith he) *for it cannot be*

be proved to be written before it was Decreed throughout the World, that one Presbyter ſhou'd be ſet over the reſt.

No ſuch *Decree* can be produced in Scripture, nor was there any ſuch *Decree* made in the Apoſtolical Times.

This is a meer Fiction of his own.

P. 38, 39. He allows the Elders in 1 *Pet.* 5. to be Governours, but not *Supreme Governours, for Chriſt and* Peter *was above them.*

Did ever Man more egregiouſly Trifle? who ever affirmed Elders to be Supreme Governours, *equal to Chriſt and his Apoſtles? Peter* here exhorts the Elders to *Feed*, or *Govern* the Flock (for ſo ποιμαίνειν ſignifies *) and to perform the Duties of Biſhops (ἐπισκοπῦντες) towards them, and he does *not ſet one Presbyter over the reſt*, therefore they were to Govern and Overſee the Church in a State of Parity.

*John 22. 16. Rev. 2. 27.

But ſaith Mr. *G. Peter was a Shepherd above them.*

1. So were all *Apoſtles*, *Prophets*, and *Evangeliſts*, above ordinary Presbyters: But he cannot ſhew in all the N. T. that Perſons of one and the ſame Order, were ſet over others of that Order; as for Example, That any one Apoſtle was ſet over the other Apoſtles, or any one Prophet ſet over the reſt of the Prophets, or any one Evangeliſt ſet over the other Evangeliſts, nor any one ordinary Presbyter ſet over the other Presbyters. Until he has proved this,

this, which has not been yet done, he does nothing.

2. He aſcribes unto *Peter* a *large Dioceſs*, *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Aſia* and *Bythynia*, 1 Pet. 1. 1.

He acknowledges, *That Paſtors and Teachers are the loweſt rank and degree of Church Officers*, Eph. 4. 11. And if ſo, they are all in *a State of Parity*: for thoſe in the *loweſt degree*, cannot be at the ſame time, and in the ſame reſpect in a *ſuperiour Degree*. He makes *Biſhops* of a ſuperiour Degree above *Paſtors* and *Teachers*; if ſo, they are either *Apoſtles*, or *Prophets*, or *Evangeliſts*, for the *N. T.* knows no other *Church Officers*, *Eph.* 4. 11. Now *Apoſtles*, *Prophets* and *Evangeliſts*, were extraordinary Officers (as the Learned acknowledge) which are ceaſed long ago. Therefore the *Rector* has excluded the *Biſhops* from the *Catalogue* of N. T. Miniſters. p. 39.

He doth *not find any expreſs Commiſſion given to theſe Elders, for exerciſing the ſeveral Supreme Acts of Power and Authority, ſuch as he noted in the Epiſtles to* Timothy *and* Titus. p. 41.

1. *Timothy* and *Titus* are no where expreſly call'd Biſhops, but *Timothy* is expreſly call'd an *Evangeliſt*. He that pleads for an *expreſs Commiſſion*, ſhou'd produce ſuch an one conſtituting *Timothy* and *Titus Dioceſan Biſhops*, which he'l never be able to do.

2. Theſe Elders are commanded to *govern the Flock*, and to *perform the Duties of Biſhops*,

and consequently are entrusted with the *Episcopal* Power.

Observe the *Rector*'s way of Arguing, he wou'd persuade us that *Timothy* and *Titus*, who are no where called *Bishops*, and one of them expresly call'd an *Evangelist*, were real *Bishops*; and that the Jewish *Elders*, who are bid to *govern* or *feed* the Flock, and to *do the Duties of Bishops*, have nothing to do with the *Episcopal Power*.

In like manner, when the Apostle tells the *Elders* of *Ephesus*, That the *Holy Ghost had made them Bishops of the Flock*, to *feed*, or *govern* the *Church of God* *, he wou'd persuade us these are *no Bishops*, though the Holy Ghost expresly affirms it; and that *Timothy*, who is expresly commanded *to do the Work of an Evangelist*, was *Bishop* of *Ephesus*.

* *Acts* 20. 17, 28.

They whom the Holy Ghost Constitutes Bishops, must be no *Bishops* with him, and he whom the Holy Ghost declares to be an *Evangelist*, must pass for a *Bishop*.

He must pardon us if we believe these expres *Testimonies of the Holy Scriptures*, before his ungrounded Assertions.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Remarks upon his Second Chapter of the Government of the Church of Epheſus *and* Crete. *The Apoſtles left the Government of the Church of* Epheſus *in the Presbyters. This Eſtabliſhment his laſt, divine, perpetual.* Acts 20. *Explain'd. The Government by Presbyters in parity never alter'd. Presbytery a Divine Remedy againſt Schiſm. Superiour Biſhops not the Remedy.* Timothy *no Dioceſan Biſhop, an unfixed Evangeliſt. Of the Aſian Angels, not ſo call'd from the Provincial Guardian Angels.* Ignatius *his Biſhop, not Dioceſan.* Titus *no Dioceſan Biſhop. Presbyters are Rulers.*

HE undertakes *to ſhew that St.* Paul, *toward the declining part of his Life, and in his abſence from the Churches, did not commit the Government to the Presbyteries in Parity, but appointed one as Supreme to preſide over them in his abſence, and by conſequence to Succeed him, when he departed the World. This* (ſaith he) *I ſhall demonſtrate he did in the Churches of* Epheſus *and* Crete, *and by a reaſonable Conſequence in all his other Churches, and the reſt of the Apoſtles muſt be preſum'd to have done the ſame.* p. 45.

1. If the Apoſtle did not appoint *one Presbyter as Supreme, to preſide over the reſt*, and to *Succeed* him in the Government of the Presbyters, the Government by his own Confeſſion muſt lodge in the Presbyters of the Churches in Parity.

2. *Timothy* and *Titus* were not *ordinary Presbyters*, but extraordinary Officers, that is, *Evangeliſts*, and as ſuch were Superiour to Presbyters, as *Apoſtles* and *Prophets* were: There is not the leaſt hint in the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, that they were Ordain'd to be the *Apoſtles Succeſſors* in *Epheſus* and *Crete*.

3. The Apoſtle did commit the Government of the Church of *Epheſus* in his abſence, to the Presbytery in a Parity, (*Acts* 20.17,18.) and that when he was taking his laſt leave of them, without thoughts of ſeeing them any more, *v.*25. This was the proper Seaſon for him to provide a *ſingle Perſon* to *Succeed* him in the Preſidency over the Presbyters of *Epheſus*, had ſuch a *Preſidency* been of neceſſary and perpetual continuance in the Church. It is but rational to affirm, That when the Apoſtles took their final leave of any Church, then was the proper time to take care of it's future Government. It is not to be imagin'd that the Holy Apoſtles wou'd be wanting in their Duty towards the Churches in ſuch a Conjuncture as this.

They were Faithful Stewards of God's Houſe, and gave the neceſſary Rules for its future Government and Conſervation: accordingly the Apoſtle is very particular and expreſs, in giving Directions about the Government of the Church of *Epheſus* after his departure.

He ſends for the Elders of *Epheſus*, Preaches his Farewel Sermon to them, *Acts* 20. 17—36. In all which there is not one word of ſetting a ſingle Perſon over them, but the whole Government of the Church is committed to them in a State of Parity: And leaſt any ſhou'd think this was a *prudential Conſtitution*, he tells them this Power was conſign'd to them by the *Holy Ghoſt, who made them Biſhops to Feed* (or Rule) *the Church of God*, v. 28.

The Elders, to whom the Government of the Church of *Epheſus* was thus committed by the Holy Ghoſt, took their ſolemn and final leave of *Paul*, with many Tears, *ſorrowing moſt of all for the words which*

which he ſpake, that they ſhou'd ſee his face no more, ver. 38.

Whether he did return again is not material at all; it's evident he thought he ſhould not, and the Elders of *Epheſus* thought ſo alſo,

There is no one Presbytery of which the Apoſtle took ſuch a Solemn leave, as he did of this; and there is no doubt, if it had been the mind of God that a ſingle Perſon ſhould be ſet over them, but the Apoſtle would have mention'd it at this time. He tells them in his Charge to them, That he *ſhunned not to declare to them the whole Counſel of God*, Acts 20. 27. and immediately adds, *v.* 28. *That the Holy Ghoſt made them Biſhops of that Flock*; this therefore is part of the Council of God, That the Church be Govern'd *by the Elders in Parity*. If the Superiority of Biſhops had been any part of the Council of God, the Apoſtle would not have with-held it from the Presbyters of *Epheſus* at this time. They that affirm, That the Government of this Church was afterwards chang'd, muſt bring as clear Proof for it, as we do for this Eſtabliſhment.

It is very plain and inconteſtable, that the Apoſtle left the Government of the Church of *Epheſus* in the Presbyters of that Church, when he took his final leave of them: And is it as plain, that the *Firſt Epiſtle* to *Timothy*, upon which his Epiſcopacy is Founded, was written after this Settlement of a *Governing Presbytery*, which moſt Ancient and Modern Chronologers, except Biſhop *Pearſon*, and two or three others, affirm to be written before?

It is very evident that the Holy Ghoſt appoints the Presbyters of *Epheſus* the ſole Biſhops of the Church, when *Paul* bid them a final Farewel: And is it as evident that an Evangeliſt, as *Timothy* was, may be degraded from an extraordinary unfixed Officer, to an ordinary fixed Paſtor?

In this *Eſtabliſhment of Presbytery*, without a Superiour Biſhop, it is obſervable, that,

1. It is an *Apoſtolical Divine Eſtabliſhment*; the Apoſtle was guided by the Holy Ghoſt in his determination, *v.* 28.

2. It was the *laſt Eſtabliſhment* which he intended to make in that Church, for he had no thoughts of ſeeing them again.

3. It was intended for *a perpetual Eſtabliſhment*, not only in the Church of *Epheſus*, but in all other Churches. Mr. *G.* allows the Government of this Church to be a Plat-form for other Churches, *p.* 45. That it was Perpetual appears, 1. Becauſe the Apoſtle gave them his *laſt Thoughts*, which are the ſame with his *dying Thoughts*, for he poſitively tells them, He ſhou'd ſee their Faces no more. 2. Here is not one Circumſtance in the whole Context that makes for a *Temporary Eſtabliſhment*. If any ſay it was *Temporary*, he ought to prove it. We may with much better Reaſon affirm, That the appointing of *Timothy* an Evangelift, to ſettle ſome things in *Epheſus* in *Paul*'s abſence was *Temporary*. 3. *Paul* doth not give the leaſt hint in his whole Diſcourſe with the Epheſian Elders of any Biſhop he had ſet over them, or that he intended to ſet one hereafter. It's certain *Paul* muſt needs know what ſort of Government God would have ſettled in his Church after his departure. We cannot imagine that he was ignorant of the *Pattern of God's Houſe*. The extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit were not given them in vain, it was to lead them into all Truth. Now if the Apoſtle knew of this pretended future Eſtabliſhment of Epiſcopacy, how comes he not to acquaint the Presbyters with it? He ſhou'd have told them how they were to Govern the Church in Subordination to their Biſhop, *preſent* or *future*. But not a word of all this in his whole Diſcourſe, A certain evidence that it was the Apoſtle's mind, and the mind of the Holy Ghoſt, that the Presbyters ſhou'd Govern the Church in common.

Timothy was now preſent, or not far off, *Acts* 20. 4, 6.---Why had not the Apoſtle recommended the Presbyters to his charge? They wanted a preſent Biſhop, according to Mr. *G*'s. Hypotheſis, for the Apoſtle was taking his final leave of them. What ſhou'd hinder his being ſet over them? His Years?

He

He was but Young when the firſt Epiſtle was written, which ſuppoſes him Biſhop of *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. There were Prophecies concerning him, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. He had been Ordain'd by Prophecy, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. And was there no Prophecy of his being future Biſhop of *Epheſus?* If there was, how comes the Apoſtle to ſuppreſs it, in this neceſſary Juncture, when it ſo greatly concern'd the Epheſian Elders to know how the Church of *Epheſus* was to be Govern'd after the Apoſtle's departure? Would not the Elders of *Epheſus* acquieſce in this determination of the Apoſtle, as his laſt and unalterable Settlement? 4. No reaſon can be given why this Government of the Church of *Epheſus* ſhould be afterwards chang'd. The Rector thinks it was done as a *Remedy againſt the Schiſms*, p. 47. But the Eſtabliſhment of the Presbytery in *Epheſus* was for a Remedy againſt Schiſms, as appears *Acts* 20. 28, 29, 30. *After my departure grievous wolves ſhall enter in among you, not ſparing the flock, and of your ſelves ſhall men ariſe*—— This he mentions as a reaſon why the Elders of *Epheſus ſhould overſee the Flock*, v. 28, 31. This Remedy was appointed by the Wiſdom of the Holy Ghoſt, which cannot Err in Judgment; He knows how to provide *apt and effectual Remedies*. He is in one Mind, and does not appoint that to day which he repents of to morrow; His Proviſions are not *meerly prudential*, like thoſe of Men's deviſing, to whom future Events are wrapt up in obſcurity; and therefore upon tryal of their aptneſs to the ends for which they were deſign'd, change their thoughts concerning them, and take new meaſures. It is not ſo with the All-wiſe God, He ſees the End in the beginning, and Effects in their Cauſes, and with Him is no *variableneſs, nor ſhadow of turning*.

Now let's hear what the *Rector* can ſay for the Change of this Government by Presbyters, ſettled in the Church of *Epheſus*.

He Promiſes to Treat of three Things.

1. *Of the Plantation and Government of the Church of* Epheſus *by* Paul, *ſo long as he was in a condition to manage the Affairs of the Church.* H 4 2. *He'll*

2. *He'll ſhew the laſt Orders he took about the Government of this Church of* Epheſus *in his abſence.*

3. *He'll give us the glory of it, unto the Writing of* Ignatius's *Epiſtles.*

As to the firſt, we agree with him, that the Presbyters of *Epheſus* were Subject to *Paul*, and good reaſon for it, for he was an Apoſtle infallibly guided by the Holy Ghoſt.

P. 47. He obſerves two Things from *Acts* 20. 28. 1. *That the Apoſtle committed the Government of this Church, in his abſence, unto theſe Presbyters (or Biſhops) for I'll ſuppoſe at preſent, that the Title and Power of Biſhops belong'd to them.*

1. Here's a plain acknowledgment of our Hypotheſis, That the Government of the *Epheſian* Church was devolv'd upon the Presbyters there, but he inſinuates as if this was only for a time, *i. e. during his abſence*; whereas the Apoſtle intended to ſee their Faces no more; ſo that his *Abſence was to be perpetual*, (as to his preſent Intention at leaſt) and conſequently the *Power committed to theſe Presbyters was perpetual.*

2, He ſeems loath to call them *Biſhops*, but is ſo kind as to *ſuppoſe it at preſent*, though the Holy Ghoſt expreſly calls them ſo, and made them ſo, *Acts* 20. 28. *Feed the flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt made you* ἐπισκόπους *Biſhops.*

P. 47. 2*dly.* He obſerves from this Scripture, *That* Paul *certainly fore-ſaw, that Schiſms would ariſe among them.* He did ſo, and provided a Remedy againſt them, by committing the Government there to the Presbyters. *If Dioceſan Epiſcopacy* had been the Remedy, how comes the Apoſtle not to mention it at this time? He makes mention of the Diſeaſe, *v.* 29. as he confeſſeth, and why not of the Remedy alſo, neither here, nor in the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians?* which he obſerves was written *to give a check to their Schiſms*, chap. 4. That Epiſtle and *Chapter* mentions the ſeveral degrees of Miniſters in Chriſt's Church, *chap.* 4. *v.* 11. but not a word of a Biſhop, *as the Center of Unity in the whole Epiſtle.* Nor does

he

he require *one ordinary Minister to obey another*, either in this Epistle, or that to the *Corinthians*, who were *pester'd with Schisms also*, as he takes notice. If Bishops had been the Remedy, the Apostle would not have omitted mentioning them, having such proper occasion given him, and writing designedly to them upon that Subject. We would reckon him but a sorry Physician that would prescribe several Remedies for a Distemper, and omit the *onely proper Remedy*. Such a Spiritual Physician the *Rector* makes the Apostle to be: *He* (says he) *foresaw the Schisms of the Ephesians, wrote an Epistle to unite them, and* P. 47. *has a warm Discouase about Unity*, Chap. 4. *And wrote another to the Corinthians to cure their Divisions.* But has not so much as touch'd upon his proper Remedy of Diocesan Bishops. There is a like warm Exhortation to Unity, *Phil.* 2. 1, 2. and yet that Church was Governed by *Bishops and Deacons*, *Phil.* 1. 1. and not by one *Superiour Bishop*.

2. The Second thing he promis'd was to tell us, P. 48. *The Order he took afterwards about the Government of the Church of* Ephesus, which was this: *The Apostle being set at Liberty, and returning back from* Italy *to the East, and being now old*, Phil. v. 9. *and finding that Factions and Divisions every where increas'd and prevail'd, Constituted* Timothy *Bishop of* Ephesus, *(as doubtless he did the same in all other places)* 1 Tim. 1. 3.

1. He takes it for granted the Epistle to *Timothy* was written after *Paul*'s Imprisonment at *Rome*, which I deny. We shall hear his Proofs in the next Chapter, which we will there consider.

If he be mistaken in this Point of Chronology, as I shall prove he is, then all his Reasonings from this Epistle fall to the ground.

2. There were *Factions and Divisions* in the Churches long before, as he himself confesseth, and as is apparent from 1 *Cor.* 3. Why had not the Apostle provided this Remedy sooner, to have prevented the *increase and prevalence* of them? A Distemper is easier prevented than cured. *If Divisions increased* under the Government of the Apostles,

was

was the new Order of Biſhops like to put a ſtop to them? Why is this then aſſign'd as the Reaſon of the Inſtitution?

3. 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. Does not ſay that *Paul* Conſtituted him Biſhop of *Epheſus*. It is agreed by the Ancients, that St. *John* the Apoſtle was at *Epheſus*, and reſided there for a conſiderable time after St. *Paul*'s departure thence, and after the Writing of the Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*. *Euſebius*, upon the Teſtimony of *Irenæus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, affirms that he return'd to *Epheſus*, after he was releas'd from his Baniſhment at *Patmos*, and lived there, and among the other *Aſian* Churches until *Trajan*'s Days. His ordinary Reſidence was at *Epheſus*, as *Euſebius* and *Clemens*, &c. affirm.

Euſe. Hiſt. Eccl. III. 17. *al.* 18. *Iren. adv. Hær.* III. 3 *Hierom. Catal. Scrip. Eccl.*

If St. *John* kept his Reſidence at *Epheſus*, and ruled that Church (as he did other Churches of *Aſia*) by his Apoſtolical Power, *Timothy* could not be the Supreme Ruler of the Church of *Epheſus*. Where an Apoſtle was Preſent and Reſident to Govern, his Superiour Authority Suſpended all Epiſcopal Juriſdiction; ſo that according to the Rector's own Principle, there was no need of a Biſhop, while an Apoſtle could Overſee the Church.

4. He gives not the leaſt Proof that *Paul made Biſhops in all other Places*. *Doubtleſs it was ſo* (ſaith he) you muſt take his *ipſe dixit* for Proof, and then all your Doubts will vaniſh.

P. 49. He confeſſes that the Apoſtle *might juſtly Admoniſh and Commend* Timothy. The Scope of his former Chapter was to prove the *Presbyters were Subject to the Apoſtles*, and therefore were not Supreme Governours: Now he owns *Timothy* to be Subject to the Apoſtle. So that his Argument, that the Preſbyters had no Power of Government, becauſe Subject to the Apoſtles, is thrown out of Doors by himſelf. Had he been ſo kind as to inſert this Conceſſion in its proper place, he would have ſpared us the trouble of ſeveral Remarks upon the former Chapter.

He picks out of Paul's *Epiſtle to* Timothy, *the particular*

ticular Rules and Orders, which are preſcribed unto him for the diſcharge of his Epiſcopal Office. P. 49, 50.

The ſeveral Powers committed to *Timothy* in this Epiſtle, he might execute as he was an *Evangeliſt*, 2 *Tim.* 4, 5. and Aſſiſtant of *Paul* in his Apoſtolical Function, and as his Delegate to Order and Regulate the Church.

It was Timothy's *part to ſee to the Qualifications of thoſe who were to be Ordained at* Epheſus. If this be the proper work of a Biſhop, how come our Biſhops to depute this work to one of their Preſbyters? P. 50.

At his death he left a Succeſſor with the ſame Powers. *Timothy* was an *Evangeliſt*, an extraordinary Officer, *Eph.* 4. 5, 11. Did he leave *Succeſſors with the ſame extraordinary Powers?* If Evangeliſts, one Species of extraordinary Officers, have Succeſſors, why ſhould not *Apoſtles* and *Prophets* alſo, have Succeſſors aſſigned them? P. 55.

Apoſtles, *Prophets* and *Evangeliſts*, were alike extraordinary, and Superiour to Paſtors and Teachers, the ordinary Officers of Chriſt's Church. No reaſon can be given why one ſort of extraordinary Officers ſhould be continued, more than the reſt which are confeſſedly *ceas'd*.

But let's hear his Proofs.

1. *It was no ways likely but that* Timothy *was expreſly Impower'd by St.* Paul, *to provide for the future Government of the Church; and perhaps his Commiſſion is in that* (2 Tim. 2. 2.) *or if not, yet he would of his own accord ſettle it upon the ſame bottom, that himſelf had received it from the Apoſtle.*

Something he would ſay, but knows not what. I expected a clear Proof, but we are put off with a perhaps it was ſo, or ſo, or ſo, one way or other it muſt be.

It's likely he was Impower'd to provide for the future Government of the Church. *Paul* provided for it in *Acts* 20. 28.

His Commiſſion in 2 Tim. 22. 11. *is to commit the things that he had heard of* Paul *to faithful Men, which ſhould be able to Teach others alſo.* Is this a Commiſſion

ſion to Ordain Biſhops? Are all *Teachers* Biſhops? The Biſhops in *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20. 28. are but meer Teachers with him, and now the Teachers in *Epheſus* are Ordaining Biſhops. The *Biſhops which the Holy Ghoſt made* in *Epheſus*, he degrades into *ordinary Teachers*, who have no Ordaining Power; and now when it ſerves his turn, he advances the Teachers Ordained by *Timothy*, into the Order of Superiour Biſhops.

But Timothy *would of his own accord ſettle the Government, as he received it.* He received the Power of an *Evangeliſt*, which was Temporary, as was that of the *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*.

P. 56. 2. *Timothy* left a Succeſſor, becauſe *Chriſt directs his Meſſage to the Angel of the Church in the ſingular Number; if that Church had been Govern'd by a Presbytery, the Meſſage muſt have been Expreſs'd in the Plural.*

1. *Angel is a Metaphorical Term*, and is generally applied to the Heavenly Spirits, which are *Miniſtring Spirits to the Heirs of Salvation*, Heb. 1. 14. So that this Title denotes a Miniſtry rather than Degrees of Superiority.

**Hæc Myſtica ſunt, operta ſunt, Figurata ſunt aliquid manifeſtum quod interprete non egeat flagitamus. De Unit. Eccl. Cap. XIX.*

2. Angel is often taken collectively, and ſeldom perſonally, in the Myſterious *Book of the Revelation*, *Rev.* 9. 11. & 14. 6, 8, 9. And ſo are Stars uſed, which are the ſame *with Angels*, *Rev.* 1. 20. & 12. 1. & 8. 10. & 9. 1. They are *Myſtical Terms*, and no clear Conſequence can be deduced from them. *Auſtin*, in his Diſputations with the *Donatiſts*, excepts againſt Myſtical, Figurative Scriptures, and requires ſome clear Texts that carry their own Evidence with them *.

The Epiſtles were Dedicated to all the Churches *as well as to the Angels*, and by the ſame reaſon muſt be directed to all the Miniſters, as well as to one. Can it be imagined that the Spirit ſhould ſpeak to all the Churches, and not to all the Miniſters.

3. There were ſeveral *Biſhops* in *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20. 28. and doubtleſs all of them were concerned in Chriſt's Meſſage, though it might be directed to one,

one, as Preſident or Moderator, for Order's ſake. But Mr. *G.* will never be able to prove, that one Angel had *Juriſdiction over the reſt*,

4. If there were any thing of certainty in the *Celeſtial Hierarchy*, which is deſcribed by the Suppoſititious *Dionyſius*, the Order of Angels (ſtrictly call'd ſo) is the loweſt of all the reſt *.

How comes that to be the higheſt Order among Eccleſiaſtical *Angels*, *which is the loweſt among Celeſtial Angels?*

He adds the Reaſon, *why 'tis ſaid Angel in the ſingular Number, becauſe* (ſaith he) *there was an Opinion current in thoſe Days, that every Province had his peculiar Guardian Angel*, Deut. 32. 8. in the LXX, Dan. 12. 1. & 10. 12, 13.

1. The current Opinion of a *Provincial Guardian Angel* is very doubtful at the beſt, and without Foundation in the Scriptures he quotes.

2. The Seventy Interpreters render *Deut.* 32. 8. *He ſet the bounds of the People according to the number of the Angels of God*; whereas according to the Hebrew it ſhould be, *according to the number of the Children of* Iſrael. They ſeem to allude to the Jewiſh Fabulous Tradition, concerning the Seventy Angels ſet over the Seventy Nations of the World †.

3. According to this Alluſion the Rector would have the Holy Ghoſt to conſtitute but one *Biſhop for one Province*, or Nation, and but Seventy for all the Nations of the World. But the Holy Ghoſt, who is no Friend to Fabulous Traditions, mentions Seven Angels in one Province, namely, the *Proconſular Aſia*, and there were as many in every Church, as there were Preſbyters therein.

4. Is it not more probable that the Spirit alludes to the שליח ציבור *the Angel of the Church*, as the Jews call'd the publick Miniſter of every Synagogue* in Conformity to the Language of the Old Teſtament, *Job* 33. 23. *Hag.* 1. 13. *Mal.* 21. 7. He is the *Meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts*. The Word מלאך Meſſenger or Angel ‡ is taken collectively for all Teaching Prieſts, *Mal.* 3. 1, 8. & 2. 7.

If

* *Extremo loco inter Cœleſtes Eſſentias Angelicam proprietatem obtinent.* De Cœl. Hierar. Cap. 9.

† *Lightf.* Vol. II. p. 402.

* *Lightf.* Vol. II. p. 133.

‡ ἄγγελος Mal. 2. 7. in LXX.

If Angel be taken Collectively by *Malachi*, why not by *John* also? I appeal to the Learned Reader, whether is most probable, that the Holy Ghost should Allude to *Provincial Angels*, the doubtful Ministers of Providence (under that Denomination) or to the *Synagogue-Angels*, the known Ministers of *Sacred Things*.

3. His third Reason to prove that *Timothy* left an
P. 59. Episcopal Successor, is taken from *Ignatius* his Epistle to that Church, in which he Names *Onesimus* their Bishop.

1. He knows that the Learned are not agreed, whether the Epistles of *Ignatius* be Genuine or no; Mounst. *Daille* hath written a Learned Dissertation to prove them Spurious. Doct. *Pearson* hath Learnedly Defended them. *Le Roque* hath with great Judgment Answered the Learned Bishop.

2. If *Ignatius* be Genuine, which is very doubtful, it should seem that in his time the Name of *Bishop*, which the Holy Ghost gives to all Presbyters in common, began to be appropriated to the first or chief Presbyter, who for Order sake Presided over the rest, and had the Honour of the chief Place in their Assemblies, and of moderating the Debates of the Presbytery, but without any Power of Jurisdiction or Government over his Brethren.

This was the Primitive Bishop, as *J. O.* hath proved in his Plea (p. 136. 139.) out of *Hilarius*, &c.

3. *Ignatius* his Bishop was but the chief Pastor of a Church that ordinarily Assembled together for Personal Communion, as will appear to any Impartial Person that Reads these Epistles with Observation. Congregational, or Parochial Bishops were throughout the World, not only in *Ignatius* his time, but in *Paul*'s time, who fixed more than one of them in every Church, *Acts* 20. 28. *Phil.* 1. 1.

That the Bishop's Diocess in *Ignatius* time, and long after, exceeded not the Bounds of a Modern Parish, appears,

1. The whole Diocess met together, with the Bishop, for Publick Worship. *Let all follow the Bishop;*

Biſhop, as Jeſus Chriſt, and the Presbytery as the Apoſtles—— *Let no Church Affairs be managed without the Biſhop. Where the Biſhop appears, let the multitude be**. * *Ign. ad Smyr.* p. 6. Edit. Voſ.

If the Prayer of one or two be ſo powerful, how much more is the Prayer of the Biſhop and the whole Church. He that *cometh not* into one place, *he is proud and ſelf-condemned* †. † *Ad Eph.* p. 20. 33, 34.

Do nothing without the Biſhop and Presbyters; Run all of you together into one Temple of God, as to one Altar ‖. ‖ *Ad Mag.* p. 33, 34.

Where the Shepherd is, there do you follow, as the Sheep ought to do *. * *Ad Phil.* p. 40.

2. Baptiſm was generally Adminiſtred by the Biſhop within his Dioceſs.

It is not lawful without the Biſhop, either to Baptize, or to Celebrate the Lord's Supper †. † *Ad Smy.* p. 6.

So *Tertullian*, *Under the hand of our Biſhop we proteſt, That we renounce the Devil, and the Pomp of this World* ‖.

3. The Biſhop had but one Altar, or Communion, in his whole Dioceſs, at which he had Adminiſtred the Lord's Supper to his whole Flock. *Give diligence to uſe one Euchariſt, for there is one Fleſh of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and one Cup, which repreſents the Union of his Blood, one Altar, and one Biſhop, with the Presbytery and Deacons, my Fellow-Servants* *. ‖ *de Cor. mil.* p. 336. * *Ad Phil.* p. 41.

One *Altar* here muſt be taken *individually, as one Biſhop is.* 'Tis abſurd to ſay, one *ſpecifical Altar*, and *one individual Biſhop.*

Tertullian ſaith of the Lord's Supper, *We receive it from no hand, but from the hand of the Preſidents, or Biſhops* †. They Communicated at leaſt once a Week, in ſome places twice or thrice. One of our Biſhops would ſcarce be able to Adminiſter the Lord's Supper in a whole Month to all his Dioceſs. † *De Cor. Milit.* p. 338.

4. No Marriages were made without the Biſhop: *Thoſe Unions were made with the Sentence of the Biſhop* ‖. ‖ *Ad Poly.* p. 13.

5. The Biſhop took care of all the Poor of the Dioceſs. *Neglect not the Widows; do you take care of them next unto the Lord: Let nothing be done without thy*

thy Advice; *let the People often Aſſemble together; inquire after all by Name; deſpiſe not Men-Servants, and Maid-Servants* *.

* *Ad Poly.* p. 12. 13.

Here the Biſhop was to take care of the poor Widows of his Dioceſs, to ſee that nothing be done without his Advice, and that the Congregation often met together; he was to take an account by Name of thoſe that were abſent, not omitting Servant-Men and Maids. What Dioceſan Biſhop can perform all this in his Dioceſs, which conſiſts of ſome Scores, or hundreds of Pariſhes?

Many more Teſtimonies might be gathered out of theſe Epiſtles, to prove that *Ignatius* his Biſhop, was but a *Pariſh-Biſhop*.

Thus we have made it evident, that the Government of the Church of *Epheſus* was lodged in the Presbyters of that Church, and that there was no Change of the Government afterwards by the Apoſtles, and that there was no Dioceſan Biſhop there in *Ignatius* his time. The preſent *Biſhop of Saliſbury*, doth ingenuouſly acknowledge, That *Ignatius* was but the Paſtor of a particular Church. See the Quotation in *J. O's.* Plea, *p.* 30.

Having invalidated the Rector's Arguments for Dioceſan Epiſcopacy, from 1 *Tim.* and *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, I proceed to conſider what he hath to offer in favour of *Titus*, his being Biſhop of *Crete*.

If *Timothy* was not Biſhop of *Epheſus*, no more was *Titus* of *Crete*; for the Epiſtles directed to both, are much of the ſame Strain. Their Powers were the ſame, and both were Officers of the ſame Species, namely, *Evangeliſts*.

Timothy is expreſly ſo call'd, and *Titus* was really one, (as will be acknowledged by the Learned) for he was the Apoſtle's Aſſiſtant, and Meſſenger to the Churches, particularly to that of *Corinth*, where he ſeems to have ſpent a great part of his time, 2 *Cor.* 2. 13. & 7. 6. & 8. 6. The Apoſtle calls him his Companion, and Fellow-Worker, 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. We find him with the Apoſtle at *Jeruſalem*, *Gal.* 2. 13.

Paul

Paul left *Titus* in *Crete, to set in Order the things that were wanting, and to Ordain Elders in every City,* as the Rector observes, *Tit.* 1. 5. P. 63.

1. It's no where said that *Paul* made him Bishop of *Crete*: The Trusts committed to him were such as an *Evangelist* might discharge: This I presume will not be denied. *Eusebius* expressly affirms, it was part of their Work to Ordain Pastors *. And the Rector acknowledges that Branch of their Power, *p.* 115.

* *Eccl. Hist.* III. 31.

2. He was left in *Crete* but for a Season (as *Timothy* was in *Ephesus*) for the Apostle charges him to *come to him to* Nicopolis, *when he should send* Artemas *or* Tychicus *to him, for there he intended to Winter.* *Tit.* 3. 12

By which it is evident his stay in *Crete*, by *Paul*'s appointment, was not long, perhaps not above half a Year, if so much; after which we never read of his returning thither; but we find him after this sent into *Dalmatia*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. and we hear no more of him.

3. He thinks *Titus* 1. 5. *That thou mightest Ordain Elders*, not rightly Translated; it should be, *That thou mightest appoint and settle Elders in every City. This presupposes that* Titus *had the Power of Ordaining also.*

1. Here he gives up one of *Titus*'s main Powers, for which they feign him a Bishop, to wit, *his Ordaining of Elders:* This he saith is not the meaning of *Titus* 1. 5. If this Text doth not prove his Ordaining Power, no one in that Epistle doth.

2. He fancies that *assigning unto Presbyters their power and special places,* was the work of *Titus* in *Crete*, and that this was *after* Ordination. Did not Titus *ordain Elders in every City, or particular Church,* as he himself explains it? *Act* 14. 23. and were they not chosen by the Multitude before Ordination, as he also confesseth in the case of his Deacon-Presbyters, *Acts* 6. He would do well to tell us, *What new power was assign'd unto the Presbyters by* Titus *after Ordination?* Perhaps he *Dream't that the Elders need-*

ed a Licence from their Biſhop, to impower them to
† *Can.* 36. Preach after Ordination, as the Canon requires. †

Paul, ſays he, *entruſts him with the charge of ſeeing*
P. 65. *unto the Qualifications of Elders,* v. 6, 7, 8, 9. *The ſame, though more compendious, than thoſe in* 1 Tim. 3.

1. All *that* he might do as an *Evangeliſt,* or the Apoſtle's Delegate: as the Biſhop's Chaplain, or Arch-Deacon, examine the Candidates for the Miniſtry with us.

2. He wiſely overlooks the *Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters,* which is aſſerted in both the places he Quotes, *Titus* 1. 5, 6, 7, 8. *Ordain Elders — if any be blameleſs; for a Biſhop muſt be blameleſs.* The Reaſon were Incogent if Elder and Biſhop were not the ſame. The Qualification of Elders here, are the ſame with thoſe of a *Biſhop* in 1 *Tim.* 3. as he confeſſeth. *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* were the ſame, not only at firſt, but even at this time, when theſe Epiſtles were Written to *Timothy* and *Titus*; which makes it evident, they were *Evangeliſts,* Superiour to Preſbyters *(Eph.* 4. 11.) and not *Biſhops* in a proper Senſe, who are one and the ſame with *Presbyters.* He will not be able to give one Inſtance in all the New Teſtament of any one ordinary *Miniſter* or *Elder,* that was made Superiour to his Brethren of the ſame Order with him: Nor of any extraordinary Officer that was made Superiour to others of the ſame kind. One Apoſtle was not made Superiour to another Apoſtle, nor one Prophet to another Prophet, nor one Evangeliſt to another Evangeliſt, though the Apoſtles were above the Prophets, and the Prophets above the Evangeliſts, and all the Three were Superiour to the Preſbyters; but no one Preſbyter is made Superiour in degree, much leſs a Ruler over another Preſbyter.

The Apoſtle impowers him (ſays he). Cap. 1. 11. *to ſtop the Mouths, or Silence falſe Teachers, to rebuke them ſharply,* v. 13. *that is,* v. 10. *the Unruly, or Nonconformiſts,* &c.

1. The Apoſtle Explains his Meaning *about ſtopping* the Mouths of falſe Teachers, in *v.* 9. *That he*

may

may be able by ſound Doctrine, both to exhort and convince Gainſayers. He ſpeaks of the Presbyters ordain'd by *Titus*, that they muſt be able to *convince Gainſayers*, and ſo to ſtop their mouths. Even private Perſons are exhorted φιμῶν, to ſtop the mouths, or *put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*, 1 Pet. 2. 15.

2. But ſuppoſe it be meant of an *Authoritative Silencing* of ſuch, it is no more than what *Titus* might do as an Evangeliſt, and the Apoſtles *Delegate*.

3. The Rector ſhews his good will to have the *Nonconformiſts* ſilenced, but it's well that *curſed Cows have ſhort Horns*.

4. The Nonconformiſts, or unruly Perſons the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, were a ſort of Judaizing Chriſtians, that retain'd the Legal Ceremonies, and the Commandments of Men, *Tit.* 1.10,13. They were not content with the Simplicity and Plainneſs of *Goſpel-Inſtitutions*, but would ſuper-add their own Inventions, and *impoſe* them upon others. Theſe were the *Nonconformiſts*, that would not conform to the Simplicity of the Goſpel, nor leave others in the quiet poſſeſſion of Goſpel-Priviledges, unleſs they ſubmitted to their *Impoſitions*, Acts 15.2. Gal. 4.9,10. and 5.1,2 Col. 2.20,23.

Grotius gives another Character, by which *theſe Nonconformiſts may be known:* He ſaith, *That the Apoſtle pointed at thoſe who taught that all Iſraelites had a part in the World to come.* * Not unlike ſome People who affirm all to be ſaved,‖ that have the happineſs *to die in their Communion*, and do not lay *violent Hands* upon themſelves.

* *Grot. in Tit.* 1.10.
‖ *Vid. Com. Prayer Burial Dead.*

We are obliged to the *Rector*, for helping us to a right Notion of *Nonconformity*. There are two ſorts of *Nonconformiſts:* Some are ſo call'd becauſe they do not conform to Unſcriptural Impoſitions; theſe the Text ſpeaks nothing of: Others, as the *Rector* well obſerves, may be ſo call'd, becauſe they do not *Conform to the Simplicity of the Goſpel* but impoſe humane nventions as Terms of Communion.

The latter of theſe two are the *Culpable Nonconformiſts.*

formiſts. I believe Mr. *G.* will not be for Silencing theſe, leſt he be condemned out of his own Mouth.

p. 66. *Paul inſtructs him to reject a Heretick*, Tit. 3. 10. *That* he might do as an *Evangeliſt*.

What he tranſcribes out of *Ignatius* from p. 67. to p. 73. doth not concern *Crete*, and we have already conſider'd *Ignatius* his Biſhop.

P. 76. *Here is not one Direction or Command given to the Presbytery, nor any ſhare in the Government communicated to them in theſe Epiſtles*, ſaith our Author.

1. The Epiſtles were directed to *Evangeliſts*, who were ſuperiour to Presbyters; and therefore it was fit the Exhortation ſhould be immediately directed to them.

2. The Directions concern'd the Presbyters alſo, as the ordinary perpetual Governours of the Church; and doubtleſs were intended for the uſe of the Church unto the end of time, 1 *Tim.* 4. 2 *Tim.* 3.

The Presbyters are concern'd, I hope, in the ſeveral Directions to Purity, Patience, Conſtancy, Faithfulneſs in diſpenſing the Word, &c. 1 *Tim.* 6. 11, 12. 2 *Tim.* 2. 3, 4. and 4. 1, 2, 3.

3. It is a very groſs miſtake, that the *Presbytery had no ſhare in the Government communicated to them* in theſe Epiſtles. *Paul* ordain'd *Biſhops there*, who among other Qualifications muſt be ſuch as *Rul'd well* their own Houſes, that they might *take care* of the Church of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 4, 5. And in 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. he mentions *Elders* that *Ruled well, and were worthy of Double Honour.*

He contradicts himſelf, and ſaith, that *the Presbyters had ſome Intereſt in the Government, (tho' their* P. 77. *Power was ſubordinate) as appears from the Council at* Jeruſalem, *Acts* 15. *even with the Apoſtles* themſelves; doubtleſs then, and much more with *Timothy* and *Titus*. They had no ſhare in the Government, and yet they had ſome Intereſt in it; himſelf can beſt reconcile theſe inconſiſtent Propoſitions.

They were ſubordinate to the Apoſtles, *Acts* 15. and ſo were the Evangeliſts: But can he produce

any

any ordinary Presbyters, that were ſubordinate to others of the ſame Order?

Ignatius, ſaith he, *allows 'em a great ſtroke in* ordering the Affairs *of their Churches, but ſtill in Subjection to their Biſhop, without whom they* could do nothing. p. 77.

It does not appear that *Ignatius* his Biſhop could do any thing without his Presbyters, no more than they could without him. And long after his time, the Biſhop had no power to determine Church-matters without his Presbyters; as appears by that Canon in the Council of *Carthage*, ——"Let the Biſhop hear no Mans Cauſe without the Preſence of "his Clergy; otherwiſe his *Sentence ſhall be void, unleſs it be confirmed by the preſence of his Clergy.* (1)

Cyprian did nothing without the Council of his Presbyters, and without the Conſent of his People. (2)

To be ſure then the People and their Biſhop ordinarily met in one place.

Ignatius frequently exhorts the People to do nothing without their *Biſhop, Presbyters* and *Deacons* in Conjunction. The Biſhop and his Presbyters made one Conſiſtory: *The Biſhop*, ſaith he, *preſiding in the Place of God, and the Presbyters in the Place of the Council of the Apoſtles.* (3) And a little after he mentions the *Complex Spiritual Crown of the Presbytery, who ſat round about him in the Church.* (4)

Again, *Let all reverence the Deacons as the Command of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Biſhop as Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Son of the Father, and the Presbyters as the Council of God, and the Conjunction of the Apoſtles.* (5)

By theſe and many other Paſſages in *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, it's evident that the Biſhop and Presbyters ſat in Council together, and were only the Guides of a *Parochial Church*, in which the Biſhop did nothing without his Presbyters, nor they without him. This Agreement of the Biſhop and his Presbyters; *Ignatius* compares to the *Strings of a Harp*; and adds, That under their joynt Conduct the whole

(1) Concil. Cath. IV. Can. 13.

(2) *Statuerim nil ſine Concilio veſtro & ſine conſenſu Plebis meæ privatâ ſententiâ gerere.* Cypr. Ep. 6.

(3) εἰς τόπον θεοῦ συνεδρείᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων. *ad Magn.* p. 33.

(4) P. 37.

(5) *Ad Tralles.* p. 48.

Church made a *Chorus*, a ſacred *Choire*, and by their conſenting Unity made a *Divine Melody*. (6)

(6) *Ad Epheſ.* p. 19.

This is agreeable to what *Jerom* affirms, that the Church was antiently Governed *Communi Concilio Presbyterorum*, by the Common Council of the Presbyters, (7) who had a Moderator or Preſident, for Order's ſake, but without any Jnriſdiction over the other Presbyters. This Moderator at the firſt was not ſo much as choſen, but the Honour was devolved in courſe upon the *Senior Presbyter*; and when he died, the next to him ſucceeded. This is expreſly affirm'd by *Hilarius* the Deacon. (8) But the Senior Preſbyters *proving ſometimes not ſo fit for the Place*, as he adds, they changed the Succeſſion, by Seniority, into that by Election. The Presbyters choſe the fitteſt Perſon to be their Moderator or Preſident, as is done in all the Preſbyteries of the Reformed Churches. This Preſident had no new Ordination, had no Power over his Brethren, and was but *Primus Sacerdos*, the firſt Preſbyter, as *Hilary* affirms. See this Quotation more at large in *F. O.*'s Plea, p. 136.----(9)

(7) *Hier. in Ep. ad Tit.*

(8) *Ut recedente uno ſequens ei ſuccederet.* Hil. in Eph. 4.

(9) *Mutata eſt ratio, ut non Ordo ſed Meritum crearet Epiſcopum*, &c. In Eph. 4. & in 1 Tim. 1. 3.

Thus it was at *Alexandria*, as *Jerom* obſerves, *ad Evagr.* By all which it appears, that the *Primitive Biſhop* was not of the ſame Species with our Modern Biſhops; and that the Government of the Churches by the Preſbyters, under their reſpective *Moderators*, is moſt agreeable to the Primitive Practice.

He thinks that he hath ſufficiently prov'd that Timothy *and* Titus *were Dioceſan Governours, tho not Biſhops in Title* ‖. I leave it to the Impartial Reader to conſider of his Proofs, and my Anſwers.

‖ P. 78.

As to *Timothy* and *Titus*, I will add theſe few things, and ſo conclude this Chapter.

1. It is certain there was an Order of Evangeliſts in the Church, *Epheſ.* 4.11. This all will acknowledge.

2. They were *Unfixed Officers*, ſubordinate to the Apoſtles, and ſent by them to ſupply their abſence, in the Churches planted by them, 1 *Cor.* 3.6. Not as their *ſtated Paſtors*, for they had Paſtors and Teachers reſident with them; but to guide the New

Paſtors

Paſtors in Faith, Worſhip and Diſcipline, during the preſent Neceſſity, until the Canon of the New Teſtament were written for a compleat and infallible *Directory* unto all Churches unto the end of Time. The Apoſtles themſelves could not be every where, and the ordinary Miniſters would be often at a loſs without their Directions. Therefore it was neceſſary they ſhould entruſt ſome Perſons, as Delegates, to go in their names, and with full inſtructions to the Churches, to ſettle, direct and eſtabliſh them.

Some of theſe *Evangeliſts* generally attended the Apoſtles, that they might be aſſiſtant to them.

Sometimes they ſend them to one Church, ſometimes to another, to make a ſhorter or a longer ſtay, as the circumſtances of their work required, and then to return again to the Apoſtle that ſent them.

Thus *Timothy* is ſent to *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 10. & 4. 17. we find him with *Paul* again, when he writ the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. at *Berea* he was with *Paul*, and abode there ſtill with *Silas*, *Acts* 17. 14. ὑπέμειναν, as he did afterwards at *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *I beſought thee*, παρεσμεῖναι *to abide ſtill*, but no more as Biſhop of *Epheſus* than of *Berea*. And yet this is the great Argument to prove him Biſhop of *Epheſus*, that *Paul* beſought him to abide there. It's true, he ſoon left *Berea*, and followed *Paul* to *Athens*, *Acts* 17. 15. whoſe companion he was: Nor was he to ſtay at *Epheſus*, but until *Paul* came to him, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. & 4. 13. And in the ſecond Epiſtle, which was written not long after the firſt, the Apoſtle calls him away to *Rome*, and ſends *Tychicus*, another Evangeliſt to *Epheſus*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. 12. 21. In 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 1. we find him in *Athens*, whence he was ſent to *Theſſalonica*, and thence returned back to *Athens*, 1 *Theſ.* 3. 1, 2, 6. After this he remov'd with *Paul* to *Corinth*, *Acts* 18. 5. thence he accompanied *Paul* to *Aſia* and *Epheſus*, *Acts* 19. 1. thence he was ſent to *Macedonia*, *v.* 21, 22. But it were tedious to follow him in all his Travels to ſo many diſtant places. He is expreſly called an Evangeliſt, 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. and no one elſe is expreſly ſo call'd but *Philip*, *Acts* 21. 8.

Titus was such another *unfixed Officer*. He was *Paul*'s partner, and fellow-helper, 2 *Cor*. 8. 23. and seems mostly imploy'd in the Church of *Corinth*, 2 *Cor*. 8. 6. 16, & 7. 6. 13. *Paul* expected him at *Troas*, and not finding him, he had no rest in his spirit, but took his leave of them, and went into *Macedonia*, 2 *Cor*. 12. 13. We find him with *Paul* at *Jerusalem*, *Gal*. 2. 1, 3. and after his being in *Crete*, the Apostle sends for him to *Nicopolis*, *Titus* 3. 12. we find him with *Paul* at *Rome*, whence he sent him to *Dalmatia*, 2 *Tim*. 4. 12. and we hear no more of him.

3. Evangelists were subordinate to the Apostles, and superiour to Presbyters, *Eph*. 4. 11. They were the Apostles Collegues and Companions, and their Authorized Messengers to the Churches, to set in order what was wanting in them, and to instruct, admonish and reprove the Presbyters, as there was occasion.

4. They had power to Ordain Ministers where there was need of them. This appears in *Eusebius*, who saith of them, 'That travelling far from home, 'they perform'd the Office of Evangelists, and 'preached Christ to such as heard not of the Faith, 'and delivered unto them the Scriptures of the holy 'Gospels with great application. When they had 'laid the foundation of Christian Doctrine in cer-'tain strange places, and ordained other Pastors, and 'committed the new Converts to their Care and 'Conduct, they went into other Countries and Na-'tions, attended with the favour and power of God. Thus he. *Timothy* and *Titus*, who were both of them Evangelists, were entrusted with the power of ordaining, We have already proved, That ordinary Presbyters have exercised this power, much more might Evangelists, who were extraordinary Officers.

Eccl. Hist. III. 31.

5. Evangelists were Temporary Officers in the Church, and are long since ceas'd, as *Apostles* and *Prophets* are.

6. *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, as we have prov'd, and therefore no *Diocesan Bishops*. It would be

be a degrading an extraordinary Officer, whose Power was general over all the Churches, in Subordination to the Apostles, to make an ordinary Officer of him, and to confine his Power to one particular Church. It's like the Degrading of the Colonel of a Regiment, to be the Captain of a single Company; or the Confining of a *Diocesan Bishop*, to a mean *Parochial Cure*.

Mr. *G.* and some Others, will own they were *Evangelists*, and Unfixed at first, but that the Apostle towards his latter End had made them Bishops, and that they were such when he wrote his Epistles to them, which was after his first Imprisonment at *Rome*: This he undertakes to prove in his next Chapter.

CHAP. IV.

The First Epistle to Timothy *was written before* Paul's *Imprisonment at* Rome, *acknowledged by the Ancients, and by the Learned Assertors of Episcopacy, Bishop* Hall, *Dr.* Hammond, *&c. Deny'd by the* Rhemists, *Bishop* Pearson, *&c.* Paul's *Journey to* Macedonia, 1 Tim. 1. 3. *considered.* Jerom *vindicated. Reasons to prove that the First Epistle to* Timothy *was written before* Paul's *First Bonds. The Second Epistle written in his First Bonds. An Objection Answered.* Acts 20. 25. *considered.*

ONE *and the leading Argument for* Timothy's *being Bishop of* Ephesus, *saith he, is grounded on* 1 Tim. 1. 3. *I besought thee to abide still at* Ephesus, *when I went to* Macedonia. P. 79.

1. To

1. To abide ſtill, doth not imply a continued reſidence. *Timothy* is ſaid to abide ſtill at *Berea*, where he made but a ſhort ſtay, *Acts* 17.14,15. This Argument will as ſoon prove him Biſhop of *Berea*, as Biſhop of *Epheſus*.

2. His ſtay there was but ſhort, that is, until the Apoſtle came to him, 1 *Tim*.3.14. and 4.13. Mr. *G.* himſelf allows in p.90. That *the Church of* Epheſus *was Govern'd by Presbyters under* Paul, *whilſt he was vigorous and active, and had opportunity to overſee both the Flock and the Elders themſelves.* The Apoſtle was vigorous and active when he writ this firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and he intended ſhortly to viſit the Flock and Elders of *Epheſus*. Therefore by his own Confeſſion *Timothy* could not be Biſhop of *Epheſus* when that Epiſtle was written.

3. He was not fixed as Reſident at *Epheſus*, for the Apoſtle afterwards calls him to *Rome*, 2 *Tim*.4. 9,21. and ſends *Tychicus* the *Evangeliſt* to *Epheſus*. We do not read that *Timothy* ever return'd to *Epheſus* again.

Thus we ſee the Weakneſs of his *Leading Argument*, as he calls it, by which we may judge of the reſt.

He adds, *That the Diſſenters, to avoid the Argument built upon* 1 Tim.1.3. *and the reſt of the Epiſtle*, ſay, *That the firſt Epiſtle to* Timothy *was written before the Meeting at* Miletus, *in which the Apoſtle committed the Flock to the Elders of* Epheſus, *and not to* Timothy, *Acts* 20.17,28.

Our Argument from *Acts* 20.17,28. holds good, tho' that Epiſtle ſhould be written after, as we have proved already in *Cap*.3.

2. It is not the Diſſenters only (as he unfairly ſuggeſts) that ſay that this Epiſtle was written before the Meeting at *Miletus*; It's the general and prevailing Opinion of the greateſt part of Chronologers, Ancient and Modern, the moſt Learned Aſſerters of Epiſcopacy not excepted. Biſhop *Hall* is of this Opinion *, ſo is Dr. *Hammond* and *Grotius*, *Lud. Capellus*, Dr. *Lightfoot*, *Cary*, &c. *Gothofredus* quotes

* *Vindic. p.97. & Div. Right of Epiſcop. Part 2d. p. 38.*

quotes *Athanasius*, *Baronius*, &c. as of the same Opinion.

The *Rhemists* were sensible that this Opinion was prejudicial to the Cause of Episcopacy, and therefore they say, tho' not positively, That the first Epistle to *Timothy*, *was written after* Paul's *first Imprisonment at* Rome, *when he was set at Liberty* *. They are follow'd by Bishop *Pearson* and by Mr. *G.* with this difference, That the *Seminary at Rhemes* deliver themselves more modestly than the Rector doth; They say, *It seemeth so*; the Rector saith, He hath *demonstrated it*. * *Rhem. Test. Arg.* in 1 *Tim.*

One that had not read Bishop *Pearson*, would think the *Rector* very ingenuous in acknowledging that he is beholden to the Bishop for what he pretends to say on *Paul*'s Journey to *Macedonia*, mentioned in 1 *Tim.* 1. 3.

That Miracle of his Time (saith he, meaning Bishop *Pearson*) *in his* Annales Paulini, *has given us a plain Account and Proof thereof: All that I pretend unto is, to build on his Foundation, and to enlarge on what that excellent Prelate has demonstrated, in a few words.* Thus the Rector. p. 80.

I will not dispute whether the Learned Bishop were *the Miracle of his Time*; if he were, Miracles are grown very Common in this last Age, for the Bishop had many Equals, whose Learned Works are nothing inferiour to his.

I dare affirm that our Rector is no *Miracle in Architecture*, for he builds very sorrily on the Bishops Foundation. Instead of raising a Superstructure, he has rather disturbed the Foundation; The Learned Bishop discourses distinctly and clearly, the Rector confusedly and darkly.

He refers to Dr. *Pearson*'s *Annales Paulini*, and pretends to enlarge on what the Bishop had demonstrated *in few words*; but takes no notice of the Bishops enlarging on that Argument in his *Dissertations*, whence he borrow'd what he pretends to say on *Paul*'s Journey to *Macedonia*, but would have his Reader believe the Enlargements are his own. See

Pearson

Pearſ. Diſſert. 1. de Succeſſion. Rom. Epiſc. Cap. IX. S. 5. ad S. 10.

But let's conſider what the Rector has to offer out of Dr. *Pearſon*. Thus he goes on.

P. 80. "The Characteriſtick of the preciſe time of *Paul*'s "beſeeching *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, is ſet down "by *Paul* himſelf, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. When I went into *Ma*"*cedonia*: This was not, *ſaith he*, at any of thoſe "times of *Paul*'s going into *Macedonia*, remembred "in the *Acts*, and therefore it was after the Apoſtle "bad the *Epheſians* farewel at *Miletus*. Here he ſpends ſeveral Pages to ſhew it was none of the times mention'd by St. *Luke*.

1. Tho' *Luke* doth not mention (in *Acts* 20.) *Timothy*'s being left at *Epheſus*, it is enough that *Paul* mentions it, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. In *Acts* 19. 21. 22. *Paul* ſends *Timothy* into *Macedonia*, appointing him to call at *Corinth* by the way, and intends himſelf to ſtay at *Epheſus*, until he ſhould come thither again to him, 1 *Cor.* 16. 10, 11. He chargeth the *Corinthians* to "Conduct him forth in Peace, that he might "come to him, for he looked for him with the Bre"thren. It's moſt likely then, he return'd from *Macedonia* to *Epheſus*, unto *Paul*. The diſturbance there, occaſion'd *Paul*'s departure before the time he had fix'd, 1 *Cor.* 16. 8. And ſo he ſetteth for *Macedonia*, as he intended, 1 *Cor.* 16. 5. *Acts* 20. 1.

At his departure from *Epheſus*, he leaves *Timothy* there behind, not as a Reſident, but in his abſence to ſupply the preſent Neceſſity, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3, 4. until he return'd again, which he intended ſhortly to do, 1 *Tim.* 2. 3, 14.

2. Nothing can be concluded from *Luke*'s ſilence in this point: for it is certain that he does not mention all the Journeys either of *Paul* or *Timothy*. In *Acts* 20. 1, 2. he ſaith that *Paul* departed from *Epheſus* to go into *Macedonia*, but ſpeaks nothing of his ſtay at *Troas*, which tho' but ſhort, was not without ſome Succeſs: Yet this Omiſſion of *Luke*, 2 *Cor.* 2. 12, 13. doth ſupply.

Where doth *Luke* mention *Paul*'s preaching the Go-

Gospel in *Illiricum*, which we are sure he did, before his Imprisonment at *Rome*, *Rom.*15.19. Nor doth he mention his preaching in *Arabia*, which is spoken of in Gal.1.17.

Nor doth *Luke* mention *Timothy*'s Journey to the *Thessalonians*, to confirm them in the Faith. In *Acts* 17.13,14. we find him at *Berea* with *Paul* and *Silas*, who were driven from *Thessalonica* by Persecution. *Paul* expects him speedily at *Athens*, vers.15. And we hear no more of him till *Paul* came to *Corinth*, *Acts* 18.15. But what's omitted by *Luke*, is mention'd by *Paul*, in 1 *Thes.* 3. 1, 2. (*viz.*) That *Timothy* was sent to *Thessalonica*, while *Paul* staid at *Athens*.

Now because I find *Timothy* in *Berea*, a Town of *Macedonia*, Acts 17.13,14. and sometime after coming from *Macedonia* to *Corinth*, Acts 18.5. Shall I therefore conclude that he was in *Berea* all that time? When I find *Paul* expecting him in *Athens*, and sending him from thence to *Thessalonica*, between those times, as is mention'd by himself in 1 *Thess.*3. 1,2. With as much reason may the Rector conclude, that because he finds *Timothy* in *Macedonia*, Acts 19. 21,22. And there again about half a year after, *Acts* 20.4. That therefore he was not out of *Macedonia* in all that time; Tho' we find the Apostle expecting him at *Ephesus*, 1 *Cor*,16. 10, 11. And leaving him there, 1 *Tim.* 1.3. when he went into *Macedonia*. He may as rationally affirm, That the first Epistle to the *Thessalonians* was written after *Paul*'s Imprisonment at *Rome*, (which all acknowledge to be written before) because it mentions a Journey of *Timothy*'s to *Thessalonica*, which *Luke*, in the History of the *Acts of the Apostles*, takes no notice of.

As the Epistle to the *Corinthians*, *Romans*, and *Thessalonians*, supply some Passages in the Travels of *Paul* and *Timothy*, omitted by *Luke* in the *Acts of the Apostles*, even so doth the first Epistle to *Timothy*, Chap.1.3, supply what's omitted in *Acts* 20.

It is usual in all Histories, for one Author to supply what's omitted by another: And in Scripture-History, what's omitted in the *Books of Kings*, is inserted

ſerted in the *Chronicles*, which are therefore call'd παραλειπόμενα, *Things omitted*, by the Lxx. What's omitted by one Evangeliſt, is reported by another.

So what's omitted by *Luke*, is mentioned by the Apoſtle to *Timothy*, to wit, That he beſought him to ſtay at *Epheſus*, 1 Tim. 1. 3. *Luke* no where mentions *Titus*, *Paul*'s Companion, whom the Apoſtle ſo often mentions in his Epiſtles.

"*Paul*, after his Releaſe from his firſt Impriſon-
" ment at *Rome*, (*continues our Author*) went back to
P. 87. " viſit the Eaſtern Churches, as he intended, *Phil.* 1.
" 25,26. *and* 2.24. *Philem.*22. *Heb.*13.23. He went
" from *Italy* to *Crete*, and ſo to *Judea*. In his paſ-
" ſage by *Crete* (which was his way by Sea to *Judea*)
" he planted a Church there: For no other time can
" be aſſign'd for it but this.

All this is confidently affirm'd, after the *Rector*'s uſual way. But,

1. Here is no expreſs proof that he viſited the Church of *Epheſus*, after his Impriſonment at *Rome*. He might viſit the *Philippians*, *Coloſſians*, and the Churches of *Judea*, without ever ſeeing *Epheſus*, as he had poſitively ſaid *he ſhould not*, Acts 20.25.

2. It is not certain whether he viſited the *Philippians* and *Coloſſians*, after his Impriſonment at *Rome*, for he doth not poſitively promiſe it. He ſeems uncertain what would become of him, *Phil.*2.23,24. He had ſome *hopes* of ſeeing them, but was not *certain*, *Philem.*22. Nay, had he paſs'd a Promiſe of ſeeing them again, it doth not neceſſarily follow he did ſee them. Many things might happen to divert his Intentions, as it happen'd with reſpect to the Promiſe he made of Viſiting the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor. 1. 15,16,17.

3. The Learned Dr. *Lightfoot* aſſigns another
* Vol. I. time * for *Paul*'s viſiting of *Crete*, and that was
P. 309. when he return'd from *Macedonia* to *Greece*, *Acts* 20. 2. And then he left *Titus* there, *Tit.*1.5. thinking that he ſhould preſently after a little ſtay in *Greece*, have ſet towards *Jeruſalem*: As he was about to ſail into

into *Syria*, the Jews laid wait for him, which made him to return through *Macedonia*, *Acts* 20.3. About that time, as Dr. *Lightfoot* conceives, he writ the Epiſtle to *Titus*, in which he calls him to *Nicopolis*, where he intended to winter, *Tit.*3.12. It is certain he winter'd in thoſe Parts, for the Spring following he ſails into *Aſia*, *Acts* 20.6. He had ſome thoughts of wintering in *Corinth*, 1 Cor.16.6. But It ſeems, altering his Reſolution, he determined to winter in *Nicopolis* a City in *Epirus*, not very far diſtant from *Corinth*. *Titus*, according to appointment, came to him, and was ſent by him to *Corinth*, to haſten the Collection for the Saints in *Judea*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 16, 17.

We do not deny but St. *Paul* might go into *Spain*, and perhaps to *Britain* alſo, as ſome affirm, but no Man ever affirm'd ſo palpable an untruth, as that all the *Fathers ſhould ſay ſo*, before this man, whoſe aſſertions are ſo crude and indigeſted, that it would require a *juſt Volume* to make a Collection of them. P. 90.

He would make *Jerom* ſay, 'That it was decreed 'in the Apoſtles time, that one elected out of the 'Preſbyters (who before Govern'd the Church in 'common) was ſet over the reſt, and that the De- 'cree was occaſion'd by the *Corinthian Schiſm*. P. 91,92.

Here he abuſes *Jerom* and his Reader, for *Jerom* no where ſaith, that the ſuperiority of Biſhops was decreed in the Apoſtles time. *Jerom* proves the *Identity* of Biſhops and Preſbyters not only from the Epiſtles of *Paul*, but from the Epiſtle of *John*, the laſt of the Apoſtles. Then he adds, *quod autem poſtea*, &c. 'That *afterwards* one was choſen, and ſet 'over the reſt, as a Remedy againſt Schiſm.

Jerom's *afterwards* muſt refer to the Writing of *John*'s Epiſtle, and ſo his meaning muſt be, *that after the Apoſtles time this Decree* was made, for he proves that Preſbyter s and Biſhops were the ſam in the Apoſtles time.

'Tis true, he alludes to the *Corinthian Schiſm*, but it's evident, That *Paul*'s Epiſtles to the Church of *Corinth* contain no ſuch Remedy againſt Schiſm, as the

the *Superiority of Biſhops*. The *Corinthian* Schiſm was a moſt proper occaſion for the *Inſtitution of Biſhops*, if they were the apteſt *remedy againſt Schiſm*. But there is not a word of it in *Paul's* Epiſtles to that Church; Nor in *Clemens's* his Epiſtle written long after. What he ſaith of *Ignatius* agreeing with *Ferom* in his account of Biſhops, we have conſidered before.

The Rector adds, 'That the Apoſtle was as much 'concern'd at the *Corinthian* Schiſm, as any other, 'and that ſeeing Diviſions ariſing every where, (not 'only at *Corinth*) he weighed the matter well, and 'aſk'd counſel of God, what he ſhould do. And in 'the end concluded, to ſet one Preſbyter over the 'reſt, to prevent the miſchief of Schiſm, God ſo ap-'pointing it. 1 *Tim.* 1. 18.

1. Doubtleſs the Apoſtle was concern'd at the *Corinthian* Schiſm, as it was a diſhonour to God and Religion, but not ſo much as it was againſt *him and his authority*, which is the reaſon Mr. *G.* aſſigns: He dare not ſay, he appointed the remedy at this time, he knew that would be too groſs: But he cunningly ſaith, *in the end he concluded to ſet up one Presbyter over the reſt*, and refers us to 1 *Tim.* 1. 18.

The firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* which mentions the Schiſms there, was written about the year of Chriſt 55, as Dr. *Lightfoot* calculates *. The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written about the year 69, according to the *Rector's* Hypotheſis. So that he makes the Apoſtle to provide the *Remedy* about fourteen years after the Diſeaſe. Was the Apoſtle *weighing the matter all thoſe years?* Or did he ask *Counſel of God*, and was not heard? Or did he neglect *Conſulting God*, till about the time he wrote to *Timothy?*

* *Vol.* 1. p. 299.

2. Had not *Paul* weighed the matter of Schiſm, and conſulted God, when he wrote to the *Corinthians?* Doubtleſs he had: If ſo, we may expect a Remedy againſt Schiſm, in thoſe Epiſtles; but there is no mention of the Superiority of Biſhops, in either of thoſe Epiſtles; therefore that is not the Remedy againſt Schiſm.

3. The

3. The Church of *Epheſus* was in danger of being broken with Schiſms, when the Apoſtle left them without any thoughts of ſeeing them any more, *Acts* 20.25. What Remedy doth he provide? Not a Superiour Biſhop, but he commits the Flock in common to the Presbyters, *Acts* 20. 17, 28. Perhaps the Rector will ſay he had *not weigh'd the matter well* at this time, nor *conſulted God* in the caſe. For our parts we are ſatisfied he was infallibly guided by the Spirit of God, in all the Rules of Government he left the Church, and as ſuch we receive them.

He has ſeveral Pages to prove that *Paul* was twice impriſon'd at *Rome*: It is very probable he was. *Euſebius* ſaith, There was a Tradition in his days, of his being Acquitted the firſt time, and that he went to ſeveral places preaching the Goſpel; and coming to *Rome* the ſecond time, he ended his Days with a bleſſed Martyrdom *. Several Ancient Writers ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe. But our Author will prove it by Scripture; nay, he'll demonſtrate it beyond all farther Controverſie.

* *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* II. 21.

This Gentleman is ſingular at Demonſtrations; but let's ſee the ſtrength of them.

"1. *Paul* left *Trophimus* at *Miletus* ſick, 2 *Tim.* 4. 20. "This was not when he met the *Epheſian* Elders; for "then he went with him to *Jeruſalem*, Acts 21. 29. P. 95.

It's moſt likely that he touch'd at *Miletus*, when he return'd from *Jeruſalem* in Bonds to *Rome*; 'tis evident he intended to ſail by the Coaſts of *Aſia*, *Acts* 27.2. and might touch at *Miletus* (which was a part of thoſe *Aſian Coaſts*) tho' *Luke* doth not mention it. Or if *Miletum* were a *City of Crete*, as *Heylin* thinks, he might leave him there when he touched upon thoſe Coaſts, as he ſail'd for *Rome*, Acts 27. 7, 8.

But if this *Miletum* be *Malta* (antiently *Melita*) as *Grotius* and *Beza* affirm, 'tis certain *Paul* was there in his Voyage from *Judea* to *Rome*, Acts 28. 1. and might leave *Trophimus* ſick behind him, as he ſaith he did, 2 *Tim.* 4. 20.

P. 96. 2. "It is pretty plain, *Paul* was once releas'd from "Priſon, *Heb.*13.24. *ſaith the Rector.*

I thought a *Demonſtration*, which he promis'd us, made things *very plain*.

P 97. 3. "That which will put the matter out of all "queſtion, is, the vaſt difference between that his "Impriſonment, in *Acts* 28. and that in the ſecond "Epiſtle to *Timothy*.

"He was in little or no danger, but held *Liberâ* "*Cuſtodiâ*, in his firſt Confinement; but in his ſe-
P. 98. "cond, he was a cloſe Priſoner, in Chains, 2 *Tim.* 1. "16. Expected no Deliverance, 2 *Tim.*4.6,7,8.

1. He was in ſome danger in his firſt Impriſonment, Phil.2.23.

2. And bound with a Chain, Acts 28.20.

3. He mentions his Deliverance, that he "might "preach the Goſpel to the Gentiles, 2 Tim. 4. 17.

Thus we have ſeen the Invalidity of his *Demonſtrations*, as he calls them; and how improbable his *Conjectures* are, (which paſs for *Demonſtrations* with him) that the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written after the Congreſs at *Miletus*, and after *Paul*'s Impriſonment at *Rome*.

For the farther ſatisfaction of the Impartial Reader, I will vindicate the *Ancient Chronologers*, and prove that the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written before *Paul*'s firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, and conſequently before that Meeting at *Miletus*, in which the Apoſtle commits the Government of the Church of *Epheſus* to the Presbyters thereof, and not to *Timothy* their pretended Biſhop; and if he was no Biſhop when that Epiſtle was written, he was none at all. If that Epiſtle was writ before the Meeting at *Miletus*, all the Arguments from that Epiſtle to prove him Biſhop of *Epheſus*, are impertinent: For the Government of that Church was committed to the Presbyters in common, and not to *Timothy* who was an Evangeliſt, and not the fixed ordinary Governour of any one Church, Acts 20.17,28. 2 Tim. 4, 5.

That

That *Paul* left *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, and wrote his Firſt Epiſtle to him, before his Impriſonment at *Rome*, appears,

1. From his Journey to *Macedonia*, mention'd 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. which can be no other than that in *Acts* 20. as moſt of the Learned agree, and as is proved already.

2. From his Excommunicating *Alexander* the Copper-Smith, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. who is the ſame Perſon that is mention'd *Acts* 19. 33 *.

This Excommunication was not long after his Apoſtacy, as we may rationally ſuppoſe, and ſo is mention'd as a late thing.

3. That place in 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15. where the Apoſtle ſaith, That he hopes *to come ſhortly unto Timothy*, agrees well with the time of his ſtay in *Macedonia* and *Greece*, mention'd in *Acts* 20. 1, 2. He deſign'd to ſtay in *Epheſus* until *Pentecoſt*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 8. but was driven away ſooner by the Tumult there, *Acts* 20. 1. and ſpent very near a whole Year in *Macedonia*, *Greece*, and thoſe parts, and return'd for *Aſia* after *Eaſter* in the following Year, *Acts* 20. 6. having Winter'd in *Nicopolis*, *Tit.* 3. 12. Sometime this Year, while he was in *Macedonia*, or the parts thereabouts, he writes his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, telling him, He deſign'd to be ſhortly with him, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. Accordingly, not long afterwards, he Sail'd for *Aſia*, and came to *Miletus*, the time being far ſpent, that he could not conveniently go to *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20. 15, 16.

Obj. But *Timothy* was with *Paul* in *Macedonia*, when he ſet out for *Aſia*, *Acts* 20. 4. How comes he to leave *Epheſus*, ſeeing the Apoſtle deſir'd him to ſtay there till he came?

Anſw. The Learned Dr. *Lightfoot* conceives it very probable, 'That *Paul* deſigning to have Sail'd 'for *Syria*, *Acts* 20. 3. came near to *Timothy*, and 'there diſcovering the danger that was laid in his 'way by the *Jews*, which alſo might have involv'd '*Timothy*, he brought him away back again with 'him, and ſo both return'd again into *Macedonia*,

* *Vid. Grot. in* 1 Tim. 1. 20. and *Eſtium*, & *Lightfoot*, Vol. 1. p. 306.

'and when *Winter* was over, they ſet for *Aſia* again *.

4. The Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* muſt be Written before *Paul*'s firſt Impriſonment, becauſe the Second Epiſtle was Written in his firſt Bonds, as the Famous Dr. *Lightfoot* affirms †; and ſo doth the Learned Dr. *Hammond* §, a Zealous Aſſertor of Epiſcopacy, to whoſe Opinion I Subſcribe for theſe Reaſons;

1. When the Second Epiſtle was written to *Timothy*, he was a Young Man; therefore *Paul* bids him *flee youthful luſts*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. For the ſame reaſon he ſaith, 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. *Let no Man deſpiſe thy Youth.* See 1 *Cor.* 16. 11.

Suppoſe *Timothy* was about 24 or 25 Years old when *Paul* took him into the Miniſtry, *Acts* 16. 34. which was about the Year of Chriſt, LI. *; from this time to *Paul*'s Second Bonds and Martyrdom, (which happen'd *A. D.* LXX. †, or LXVIII. ſay others ‖) there paſs'd near XX Years; ſo that by the loweſt Computation, *Timothy* muſt be above XL. when the Apoſtle was under his Second Confinement at *Rome*. It is not likely the Apoſtle ſhould caution him againſt *youthful luſts*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. at three or four and fourty Years old, eſpecially being *a ſickly man*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 23.

Therefore he wrote this Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, many Years before his laſt Confinement, *i. e.* in his firſt Bonds, when *Timothy* was indeed a young Man, about 33, or 34, or perhaps Younger, not much Elder than when he wrote *his firſt Epiſtle* to him, in which he ſaith, *let no man deſpiſe thy youth*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. Or when he ſent his Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* (which all confeſs to be Penn'd before his firſt Bonds) that chargeth them not *to deſpiſe him* for the ſame Reaſon, 1 *Cor.* 16. 11 *.

For the ſame Reaſon he calls him Son, 1 *Tim.* 1. 2. 18. 2 *Tim.* 2. 1.

2. *Paul* ſends for *Timothy* to *Rome*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. His Letter finds him ſomewhere near *Epheſus*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 19. & 1. 16, 18. & 4. 13. Accordingly *Timothy* came

* *Lightf.* Vol. 1. p. 312.
† *Lightf.* Vol. 1. p. 324.
§ *Ham. in* 2 Tim.
* *Lightf.* Vol. 1. p. 294.
† *Euſeb.*
‖ *Lightf.*
**Vid. Piſc.* & *Grot. in Loc.*

came to *Rome*, and it doth not appear that he came thither before this time that he was ſent for. The laſt mention we have of him in the *Acts* is, That he accompanies *Paul* into *Aſia*, *Acts* 20. 4. We read nothing of him in *Paul*'s Voyage to *Rome*, therefore 'tis moſt likely, he parted with *Paul* at *Miletus*, and ſtaid among the *Aſian Churches*, until he was ſent for by *Paul* to *Rome*. After his coming thither, the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, *Coloſſians*, and *Philemon*, were written, for his Name is Prefixed to them, as well as *Paul*'s: Now theſe Epiſtles were written in his Firſt Bonds at *Rome*, *Phil.* 1. 26. & 2. 23, 24. *Philemon.* 22. This will not be deny'd: therefore the Second Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written in his firſt Bonds, though ſometime before theſe.

3. *Timothy* is deſir'd to bring *Mark* with him to *Rome*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. Accordingly he went to *Rome*, and was with *Paul* at *Rome*, when he wrote his Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* and to *Philemon*, *Col.* 4. 10. *Philem.* 24. which Epiſtles were undoubtedly written in his firſt Bonds. It cannot be pretended that *Mark* went with *Paul* to *Rome*; there is not the leaſt mention of him, either in Scripture, or any other approved Author, as *Paul*'s Companion to *Rome*. He was ſent for in this Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, to come along with him to *Rome*, and it is certain he was with *Paul* in his firſt Bonds.

4. He mentions, in 2 *Tim.* 3. 11. his Sufferings which befel him at *Iconium*, at *Lyſtra* and *Antioch*, of which we have an account in *Acts* 14. Now this Perſecution happen'd about the Year of Chriſt, 49, or 50*: *Paul*'s Second Impriſonment at *Rome*, was in the Year of Chriſt 68, or as others, 69, which was the Year in which he wrote this Epiſtle, according to this new *Hypotheſis*: So that his Perſecutions at *Antioch*, *Lyconium*, and *Lyſtra*, were near 20 years before his laſt Impriſonment at *Rome*. Now it is not likely that the Apoſtle would mention an Event ſo long paſt, when there were other latter Sufferings of his that were much freſher in his Memory. Therefore we may rather think, that he men-

* *Light.* Vol. 1. p. 291.

tions his Sufferings at *Antioch*, &c. as a late thing, not very many Yeats paſt, and if ſo, this Second Epiſtle was written much earlier than is pretended.

5. The Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* was written in *Paul*'s firſt Bonds, (as Mr. *G.* confeſſeth, *p.* 86, 87.) and was ſent by *Tychicus*, *Eph.* 6. 21. who was alſo the Bearer of the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, *Col.* 4. 7. which was written at the ſame time with that to *Epheſus*, as he obſerveth, *p.* 87. *Tychicus* had gone along with *Paul* for *Rome*, *Acts* 20. 5. This ſending of *Tychicus* to *Epheſus* is mention'd in 2 *Tim.* 4. 12. Therefore this Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which mentions this Journey of *Tychicus* to *Epheſus*, was written about the ſame time.

6. It is agreed by all, That *Paul* was not ſet at Liberty in his laſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, but he was delivered from the Confinement mention'd in the Second Epiſtle to *Tim.* Chap. 4. 17. Therefore that Epiſtle was not written in his laſt Bonds. *He was delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion, that all the Gentiles might hear the* Goſpel. That is, that he might go about, and preach the Goſpel to many Nations.

This is agreeable to the account that the Fathers give of his Preaching the Goſpel to ſeveral Nations after his Impriſonment. Hence it's evident, ſaith *Eſtius* †, That this Epiſtle *was not written in* Paul's *Laſt Bonds.*

† *Eſt. in Loc.*

7. It is undeniable that *Luke* accompanied *Paul* to *Rome*, *Acts* 27. & 28. He includes himſelf all along in the Narrative he gives of their dangerous Voyage to *Rome*, and ſpeaks in the firſt Perſon plural, *Chap.* 28. 16. *When we came to Rome.* He was at *Rome* with *Paul* when he wrote the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, which was written in his Firſt Bonds, as is confeſs'd, *Col.* 4. 14. And ſo he was when *Paul* ſent the Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. Therefore this Epiſtle was Penn'd during his Firſt Bonds.

8. He mentions his *Cloak*, &c. which he left at *Troas* with *Carpus*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 13. Theſe were left there,

there, as it ſeems, as he was going among his Nation in *Judea*, *Acts* 20. 16. where he had no occaſion for his *Roman Habit*, which might have proved inconvenient in *Judea*, among his own Countrey-Men, who were too much prejudiced againſt him already, *Acts* 21. 21. and to whom he was deſirous to render himſelf acceptable by all Lawful Compliances, *Acts* 21. 26. But now he was at *Rome*, he had need of his *Roman Garb*, which was the *Pallium*, or Cloak. There is no Evidence of his paſſing by *Troas* to *Rome*, in his laſt Journey thither, nor can any reaſon be given why he ſhould leave his Cloak there, as he went to *Rome* and *Roman Colonies*: but it looks Rational enough that he ſhould do ſo, when he was going into *Judea*, and that he ſhould ſend for it in his firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, whither he was carried Priſoner from *Judea*. And therefore this Second Epiſtle was Written in his firſt Bonds.

9. It ſhould ſeem he was under a favourable Confinement, when he writ the Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, for he mentions only one Chain, 2 *Tim.* 1. 16. and ſo doth *Luke*, in *Acts* 28. 20. which ſpeaks of his firſt and favourable Confinement, *Eph.* 6. 20. In his Second Impriſonment he was more ſeverely handled, as all agree. Now ſuch as were in ſtrict Cuſtody were bound with *two* Chains, *Act.* 12. 6. Hence it ſhould ſeem to follow, that this Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which ſpeaks but of one Chain, was Written in *Paul*'s Firſt Impriſonment, which was more favourable than the Second.

10. *Demas* was with *Paul* at *Rome*, in his Firſt Impriſonment, *Col.* 4. 14. but the tediouſneſs of *Paul*'s Confinement, and the *love of this preſent world*, which is inconſiſtent with patient Suffering, tempted him to forſake the Apoſtle, 2 *Tim.* 4, 10. We read nothing of his being there in his Second Impriſonment, but we are ſure he was there in *his firſt Impriſonment*, and that he left him *in his Bonds*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. which we may rationally conclude were his *firſt Bonds*.

I will not mention *Paul*'s leaving *Trophimus* at *Mi-*

letus ſick, 2 *Tim.* 4. 20. which might well be when he went in Bonds from *Judea* to *Rome*, as we obſerv'd before.

Nor will I inſiſt upon *Eraſtus* abiding at *Corinth*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 20. *Rom.* 16. 23. *Acts* 19. 22. when *Paul* ſent for *Mark* from thence unto him. That he was at *Corinth* when *Paul* wrote his Second Epiſtle thither, may be gathered from 2 *Cor.* 8. 19 *. *who was choſen of the Churches to travel* ----- *Mark* was choſen by the Church of *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* 12. 25. and by the Church at *Antioch*, *Acts* 13. 5. It's true, *Paul* had taken ſome diſtaſte at *Mark*, *Acts* 15. 39. but he was reconciled to him again, as appears from 2 *Tim.* 4. 20. We have prov'd already, that *Mark* was ſent for in *Paul*'s Firſt Impriſonment, therefore his Reaſon that *Eraſtus* abode at *Corinth*, to ſupply *Mark*'s Abſence, refers to the ſame time.

* *Vid. Lightf.* Vol. I. p. 311.

Theſe Reaſons put together, may be ſufficient to ſatisfie any unbiaſs'd Man (for nothing will convince Prejudiced and Intereſſed Perſons) that the Second Epiſtle to *Timothy* was Written in *Paul*'s firſt Bonds, and therefore his Firſt Epiſtle muſt be written before his Firſt Bonds, when he was in *Macedonia*, or thereabouts, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *Acts* 20. 1, 2. Unleſs any will ſay, That his Second Epiſtle was Written before the Firſt.

It is remarkable that this Epiſtle has *more Characters*, and all *concurring*, of the Time in which it was written, than any one of *Paul*'s Epiſtles, the Holy Ghoſt ſo ordering the Matter, for the Conviction of ſuch as are willing to receive the Truth.

There is one Paſſage in this Epiſtle, which hath occaſioned ſome Doubt about the time of it, *viz.* 2 *Tim.* 4. 6. *I am now ready to be offer'd, and the time of my departure is at hand.* Which ſome have underſtood of his approaching Martyrdom. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι, I am prepared, or *ready for death*, as *the Sacrifices were for Offering*: this ſeems to reſpect his Martyrdom as near at hand.

But if we compare this with other Scriptures, it will be evident that he ſpeaks not of an approaching

ing Martyrdom, but that he was grown old, and worn with Travels and hard Labour, and could not now laſt long: And beſides all this, in Bonds at preſent, and ſo in continual danger.

Thus *Lightfoot*, *Hammond*, and others underſtand the place, and that this is the meaning of it will further appear:

1. He uſeth the ſame Words in the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, which was written in his *firſt bonds*, *Phil.* 2. 17. ἀλλ εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι, *If I be offered upon the Sacrifice of your Faith.*

2. He ſpeaks the ſame thing in different Expreſſions ſome Years before, *Acts* 21. 13. *I am ready to dye at* Jeruſalem. 1 *Cor.* 4. 9. *God hath ſet us forth to be as it were,* ἐπθανατίους, *appointed to death.* 1 Cor. 15. 31. *I dye daily.* So in 2 *Cor.* 4. 11. ἀεὶ εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα, *we are always delivered unto death.*

3. That a ſudden Martyrdom is not intended in 2 *Tim.* 4. 6. appears from *v.* 17, 18. *I was delivered*—— *and the Lord ſhall deliver me.* Much like that in 2 *Cor.* 1. 10. *Who delivered us from ſo great a death, and doth deliver; in whom we truſt that He will yet deliver us.*

4. Suppoſe the words ſhould imply ſome apprehenſions of his approaching Death; *that* he had long before, 2 *Cor.* 1. 8, 9. *We deſpaired even of life, but had the ſentence of death in our ſelves.*

5. The Apoſtle was now grown *aged*, as is evident in the Epiſtle to *Philemon*, Written in his firſt Bonds, *Philem. v.* 9. 22. and a *Priſoner*, not knowing how God would diſpoſe of him, *Phil.* 2. 23. As he was aged he lived in conſtant expectations of Death; as he was a *Priſoner*, in danger of being made a Sacrifice, he could not but think his diſſolution was approaching, 2 *Cor.* 5. 2, 3, 4. —— *Acts* 20. 23.

Being ſtricken in Years, and *waſted* with indefatigable Labours, and hard Sufferings, and in Expectation of the Fiery Tryal, he might well ſay he had *finiſhed his courſe*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 7.

But

But yet he did not expect to dye very ſuddenly, for he ſends a Letter from *Rome* to *Timothy*, at, or near *Epheſus*, to deſire him to come to him, *before Winter*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 21. It wou'd require a conſiderable time to ſend a Letter from *Rome* to *Epheſus*, and for *Timothy* to return from *Epheſus* to *Rome*, and to take *Mark* with him, who it ſhould ſeem was at *Corinth*: all this could not be done under three or four Months, and perhaps a longer time, conſidering the ſeveral Winds that were neceſſary for ſuch a Voyage.

Had *Paul* been under a Sentence of Death at this time, he could not have made an appointment for *Timothy* to come unto him at a diſtant time. Priſoners in conſtant Expectations of Death, do not uſe to make appointments for a remote Time to come.

Thus we have Vindicated the Ancient and Received Opinion, That the Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was Written before *Paul*'s Impriſonment at *Rome*, and have alſo proved that the Second Epiſtle to him was Written in his Firſt Bonds; and therefore the Journey to *Macedonia* mention'd in 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. muſt be that in *Acts* 20. 1, 2.

Our Argument then holds good, That *Timothy was no Biſhop of Epheſus*, becauſe he was no Biſhop there when the Firſt Epiſtle was Written to him, for *Paul* commits the whole Government of the Church of *Epheſus* unto the Preſbyters of it, after the Writing of that Epiſtle, and at a time when *Timothy* was preſent, or not far off. *Acts* 20. 4. 17, 18——28. And when the Apoſtle *knew he ſhould never ſee their faces more*, Acts 20. 25.

To this laſt Scripture the *Rector* oppoſeth two Things.

P. 107. 1. He Corrects the Tranſlation, and ſaith it ſhould be rendred ——*I know that ye ſhall no more ſee my face all of you*; ——'*tis in no wiſe probable that all of them ſaw his face any more, Death, and other Caſualties would doubtleſs hinder it.*

The *Elders*, to whom he ſpake thoſe Words, we may

may presume understood *Paul*'s meaning a little better than the Rector. *They all wept sore, and sorrow'd most of all for the Words which he spake*, that they should see his Face no more, *Acts* 20. 37, 38. The Words *All of you* are here omitted, which spoils the *Parson*'s gloss. It cannot be imagin'd they wou'd all have wept so passionately, had they expected to have seen him again. It's Pity but our *Critical Author* had been there to explain *Paul*'s Words, and to mitigate their ill grounded sorrow, by telling them, *they shou'd see his Face again*, tho perhaps some of them might Dye before he came again. But he himself is sensible of the impertinency of this *new Criticism*, and therefore adds that he will *not insist on it*.

2. *When* Paul *saith, he knew they shou'd see his Face no more, 'tis to be understood of a conjectural Knowledge only, as he saith.* P. 108.

1. It is enough to confirm our Argument, that *he thought* he shou'd see their Faces no more, 'tis undeniable he had no Hopes of seeing them again, and wou'd not be wanting to settle the Government of this Church at this Time: And it is as undeniable, he settled the Government in the *Presbyters*, and not in a *Diocesan Bishop*, Acts 20. 17, 28.

The Assertors of Episcopacy, and among others, Mr. *G.* saith, 'That the Apostles settled the Government by Bishops, when they were leaving the 'Churches, and could not oversee them any longer: This was the Case here. The Apostle is leaving the Church of *Ephesus*, without any thoughts of seeing it again, and at this Time commits the Government of the Church to the Presbyters. Nor was this Constitution Temporary or Prudential, but *Divine*, Acts 20. 17, 28. It was an appointment of the *Holy Ghost*, *Take heed to your selves and the flock*, saith the Apostle, *over which the Holy Ghost made you Bishops, to feed the Church of God*, but of this we have spoken before.

2. *Paul* doth not use to express himself *so positively*, when he speaks *conjecturally*. It wou'd look like rash-

raſhneſs, if not worſe, in any of us, to ſay poſitively, *I know I ſhall never ſee ſuch a Place, or People*, and afterwards to excuſe it, by ſaying it was only a *conjectural Knowledge*. The Holy Apoſtle did *not uſe Lightneſs in* his Speech, 2 *Cor.* 1. 17, 18. he ſaith in *Acts* 20. 29. *I know that grievous Wolves ſhall enter in among you.* Was this alſo a *conjectural Knowledge?* If this was a certain Knowledge, as it is evident by the Event, it was, why ſhou'd we not underſtand, *ver.* 25. of a certain Knowledge?

3. In the *Form of Ordaining Prieſts*, the Words are thus rendred. *And now behold*, I am ſure, *that henceforth yea all (through whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdom of God) ſhall ſee my Face no more* *. 4. It has not been yet proved that *Paul* was at *Epheſus* after this Time. One wou'd expect a very clear Proof that he was afterwards there, from thoſe that dare Charge the Apoſtle with *raſhneſs* in his Expreſſions. All the Proof we have is but a *qualified Promiſe* of viſiting *Macedonia* and *Coloſs* again, *Phil.* 2. 24. *Philem.* 22.

* *Form of Ordaining Pr.* Lond. *Edit. for* Bl. Pawlet, 1684.

1. But what is this to *Epheſus?* Here is not a Promiſe of ſeeing the Church of *Epheſus* again. It will be ſaid it is *likely* he did, I ſay, it is more likely he did not, becauſe he himſelf ſaid, *he knew he ſhou'd never ſee them again.*

2. He doth not poſitively Promiſe to ſee *Macedonia* and *Coloſs* again, *Phil.* 2. 24. *Philem.* 22. *I truſt*, &c. Here he ſpeaks more doubtfully and not ſo poſitively as in *Acts* 20. 25. *I know*, &c. This Gentlemans way of arguing is very ſingular, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks doubtfully, *I truſt*, he is ſure he performed: But when he ſpeaks poſitively, *I know*, he is ſure he was miſtaken. He expounds his *Conjectural* Expreſſions for *Abſolute*, and his *Abſolute* Expreſſions for *Conjectural*.

I overlook his confident Triumphs, and weak Reflections with which he ſtuffs the concluding Pages of this Chapter, as having nothing of Argument in them, and therefore not worthy my Notice.

I will follow him to his next Chapter, which Treats.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of Evangeliſts. Whether they were fixed? Neg. Acts 21. 8. *conſidered.* Timothy *and* Titus *unfixed.* Hilarius *his account of Evangeliſts.* Euſebius's *Teſtimony vindicated.* Mark *no fixed Evangeliſt*, Chryſoſtom's *account of Evangeliſts, agreeing with* Euſebius.

THIS *Species of Church Officers*, ſaith he, *is ſpoken of but thrice in the Holy Scriptures*, Acts 21. 8. Eph. 4. 11. 2 Tim. 4. 5. P. 113.

The Office and Work are ſpoken of in many Places, but the *Name* only in three Places. It is agreed by the Learned, that thoſe who are called the Apoſtles *Fellow-workers*, and were ſent by them as their *Meſſengers* to the Churches to ſupply their Abſence, were *Evangeliſts*: This is acknowledg'd by Mr. *G.* P. 118. where he ſpeaks of *Itinerant Evangeliſts.*

We agree with him, 'That Evangeliſts were in 'Dignity and Power next to Prophets, and above 'all other Church Officers. P. 113.

He proceeds to give us a Deſcription of an *Evangeliſt*, 'It appears, ſaith he, from 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. that 'an Evangeliſt was one entruſted by the Apoſtles 'with the Government of ſome Church. That *Timothy* was an Evangeliſt, and that *Titus* therefore 'was another Evangeliſt. For it has been demon-'ſtrated already (*Cap.* 2.) that all the Supream 'Powers of Eccleſiaſtical Government were commit-'ted to them in their reſpective Churches. Ibid.

The meaning of this Paragraph is, that Evangeliſts are *Dioceſan Biſhops*, for he makes *Timothy* the *Evangeliſt*, that is, the *Biſhop of Epheſus*, and *Titus* the

the *Evangelist* or *Bishop of Crete.* It is well he owns *Timothy* and *Titus* to be *Evangelists*, it is as much as we desire. I, but *Evangelists* and *Bishops* are the same. To which I Answer.

1. Few or none of his *Judicious Brethren* will subscribe to this new Notion of *Evangelists*, by which he evidently gives up the whole Cause. When he happens now and then to Answer the Title of his Book (which is *Testamen Novum*) by advancing some *New Notion*, he weakly betrays the Cause he pretends strongly to defend.

2. He owns *Evangelists* to be a Species of *Church Officers* distinct from *Pastors and Teachers* according to *Eph.* 4. 11. and consequently he denies the *Diocesan* Bishops to be the *Pastors* of their respective Churches. I doubt he has forgot the Prayers of the Church, in which the Bishops are call'd the Pastors of the Flock *.

* *The Prayer in the Ember Weeks.*

If he say they are both *Pastors* and *Evangelists*, he confounds those Officers whom the Apostle distinguisheth.

The Presbyters are the *Pastors of the Flock*, that is the ordinary and settled Rulers of it, *Acts* 17. 28. 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. (*Rev.* 2. 27.) Let them have this Power which the Holy Ghost hath given them, as the *proper Bishops* of the Flock, and when he hath prov'd Evangelists to be *Diocesan Bishops*, we will readily receive them.

3. Dr. *Hammond* saith, that the *Pastors* (not the *Evangelists*) in *Eph.* 4. 11. were the Bishops that govern'd particular Charges.

4. I have fully answer'd his Arguments by which he pretends to demonstrate that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops of *Ephesus* and *Crete*.

P. 114. 115. 'He advances a new Order of *Evangelists*, who 'were the fixed Governours of some Cities and the 'Countries Adjacent: And cannot altogether allow 'their Notion, who say an Evangelist was an unsetled Church-Officer that went from Place to Place 'to finish the Churches begun by the Apostles, and 'particularly to ordain Elders among them: And

'yet

'yet he grants that an Evangelift, as *Ravanellus* ex-'preſſeth it, Ordain'd Elders *Oppidatim*, in every 'Town or Village.

1. He owns that *Evangeliſts* might Ordain in every Town, and why not in every City? *Ravanellus* explains his *Oppidatim*, by *Tit.* 1. 5. κατὰ πόλιν, in *every City*: But he wilfully overlooks that, for he knew that there were many *Cities* in *Crete*, and according to the Rule that every City muſt have a Biſhop, *Titus* muſt be *Arch-biſhop of Crete*: And the ſole Power of Ordination being in *Titus*, it would naturally follow, that none but *Arch-biſhops* can Ordain. *Andrew Cretenſis* calls him *Arch-biſhop*, and ſaith, he had twelve Biſhops under him.

2. *He cannot* altogether *allow Evangeliſts to be unſettled Officers.* It ſeems he does in part allow it, it's too bright a Truth to be deny'd, but he endeavours to obſcure it what he can, and wou'd fain perſwade his Reader, that Evangeliſts were fixed Officers: But let's hear his Proof. P. 115.

Philip was a fixed Evangeliſt, becauſe Luke *leaves him at* Cæſarea, *Acts* 8. 40. *And we find him there almoſt twenty Years after, having a Houſe and a ſettled Family*, Acts 21. 8.

1. When he has prov'd, that *Philip* reſided at *Cæſarea*, as the ſettled *Biſhop* of that Church, and that he was no where elſe all thoſe Years he may talk of a *fixed Evangeliſt*.

2. May not an unſettled Officer have a ſettled Family? Which he may Viſit at Times? *Paul* continued two Years at *Epheſus*, Acts 19. 10. a Year and a half at *Corinth*, Acts 18. 11. two Years in his own hired Houſe at *Rome*, Acts 28. 30. was he therefore a *ſettled or fixed Apoſtle?*

3. As much as we have of the Hiſtory of *Philip* beſpeaks him an *unſettled Officer*. We find him in *Samaria*, Acts 8. 12. with the *Ethiopian Eunuch*, in the way from *Jeruſalem* unto *Gaza*, Acts 8. 26. at *Aſotus*, and Preaching in all the Cities, till he came to *Cæſarea*, Acts 8. 40. which perhaps might be his Birth-place, or he might Marry there, which is more

more likely, because we read of Four Daughters he had, which did Prophecy, *Acts* 21. 9. He was an *Evangelist* before he came to *Cæsarea**, for he Preached up and down by Vertue of an extraordinary Call, *Acts* 8. 6, 7, 26, 39. and it is not to be imagin'd he laid aside the Office of an Evangelist after his Marriage: And therefore *Luke* testifies concerning him, that although he was Married, and had a settled Family, he was an *Evangelist*, an unsettled extraordinary Officer still, *Acts* 21. 8, 9, 10. He could not produce any Ancient Author that makes him Bishop of *Cæsarea*. *Eusebius* saith he dyed at *Hierapolis*†.

His other Proof from *Timothy* and *Titus* being fixed or settled Evangelists, we considered before: And it is *Petitio Principii*.

I will add this.

1. All that he saith to prove them *fixed Officers* of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, depends upon his Supposition that the Epistles to them were Written after *Pauls* first Bonds at *Rome*, which I have disprov'd with respect to the first Epistle to *Timothy*, and it's confess'd by all that this Epistle to *Timothy*, and the Epistle to *Titus* were Written about the same Time. The Epistle to *Titus* was Written, when *Paul* was in *Macedonia* designing to Winter in *Nicopolis*, *Tit.* 3. 12. He Promises to send *Tychicus* or *Artemas* unto *Titus*, the former of these two was with *Paul* in *Macedonia*, and afterwards accompanied him into *Asia*, Acts 20. 4. Therefore this Epistle was Written before *Paul*'s first Imprisonment at *Rome*.

2. *Timothy* and *Titus* were no *resident Evangelists* of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, for the Apostle calls them both away: He calls *Titus* to *Nicopolis* from *Crete*, *Tit.* 3. 12. which is an evidence he was to make but a short stay there, to *set in Order the Things that were wanting*, Tit. 1. 5. Which when he had done, he must attend the Apostle, as he had done before: Accordingly he went to *Paul* to *Nicopolis*, and was his Companion and Messenger to several Churches, and at last is sent by him to *Dalmatia*, 2 Tim. 4. 10.

* *J. Pears. Lect.* in *Act.* v. §. 1. & 5. p. 66. 68.

† *Euseb.* Hist. III. 25. *Edit.* Lovan. 1569.

4. 10. And we hear no more of him. It cannot be made to appear that ever he return'd more to *Crete*.

The Apoſtle calls *Timothy* away from *Epheſus* to *Rome*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. for the ſame Reaſon that he ſends for *Mark*, both being *profitable to him for the Miniſtry*, having none with him but *Luke*, *v.* 10, 11. accordingly *Timothy* came to him, and he promiſes to ſend him to *Macedonia*, and not to *Epheſus*, Phil. 2. 19. But it ſhould ſeem he could not go as ſoon as he intended, being made a Priſoner at *Rome*: When he was ſet at Liberty he accompanied the Apoſtle to *Judea*, or deſign'd ſo to do, *Heb.* 13. 23.

From all which it appears, that they were Evangeliſts in a proper Sence, that is, extraordinary and unſettled Church-Officers who aſſiſted the Apoſtles in their Miniſtry. and were their Meſſengers to the Churches to eſtabliſh, ſettle and build them up as they had Directions from the Apoſtles, having Power to ordain Elders, and to put forth other Acts of Government as occaſion was offer'd. All this is evident from the Powers committed to *Timothy* and *Titus*, which doubtleſs were the ſame in other Churches, as in *Epheſus* and *Crete*, for they were Evangeliſts as much in one Place as in another: And the Power of Evangeliſts was the ſame in all Places.

3. This agrees with the account that *Hilarius* gives of *Evangeliſts*, who are ſucceeded by the Deacons, as he thinks; as the *Prophets* are by the *Presbyters*, and the *Apoſtles* by the *Biſhops*.

Evangeliſts, ſaith he, did *Evangelize or Preach the Goſpel, ſine Cathedrâ*, without a fixed reſidence.

F. O. quoted *Euſebius* in his Plea (*P.* 18.) to the ſame purpoſe, he ſaith of the Evangeliſts, *Hil.* in 4. Eph.

'That they Preached Chriſt to Infidels, ordain'd 'Paſtors, and paſſed into other Countries and Nations.

To this Mr. *G.* Anſwers, *It was not the proper Work of Evangeliſts to go up and down Preaching the Goſpel.*

Euſebius ſaith, 'They went far from their Houſes,

'did the Work of Evangelists, and diligently 'Preach'd Christ to such as had not as yet heard 'the Word of Faith, and deliver'd to them the 'Scriptures of the Holy Gospels, ordain'd other Pa-'stors, and went into other Countries and Nations.

I have proved out of *Paul*'s Epistles, they were unsettled Officers, and therefore it was their proper Work to go up and down Preaching the Gospel, and *Eusebius* affirms they did so.

But, saith he, *Eusebius writes*, L. 2. Cap. 24. *That* Mark *the Evangelist being Dead*, Annianus (so he writes it for *Anianus*) *enter'd upon the Administration of the Church of* Alexandria; hence he infers, *That* Mark *was a resident Evangelist, not roving up and down.*

1. He may as well say, that *Peter* was a *resident Apostle*, because *Eusebius* saith, that *Linus* succeeded him in the Government of the Church of *Rome* *.

Eccl. Hist. III. 2. 4.

2. *Mark* was no *resident Evangelist*, he was a Companion of *Peter* and *Paul*, and travell'd with them up and down, and was sent by them to several Churches, in *Acts* 12. 25. we find him with *Paul* and *Barnabas*, at *Perga* in *Pamphylia*; he left them and went to *Jerusalem*, Acts 13. 13. he afterwards for some time accompany'd *Barnabas* to *Cyprus* and other Places, *Acts* 15. 39. We find him after that with *Timothy*, or not far from him, and sent for by *Paul* to assist him in the Ministry, 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. when he was Prisoner at *Rome*. We find him there with *Paul*, Philem. 24. from whence he sends him to *Colosse*, Col. 4. 10. When *Peter* wrote his first Epistle, *Mark* was with him at *Babylon*, 1 Pet. 5. 13. and yet our *Rector* has the Confidence to call him *a resident Evangelist*.

† *Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 14. 15.

3. *Eusebius* calls him *Peter*'s Companion †, and adds, *They say he first passed over into* Egypt, *and Preach'd there the Gospel, which he had written, and planted the first Churches in* Alexandria.

Perhaps he might End his Days *here* in setling this Church, as all the Evangelists and Apostles must end their Days in some place or other, and in the Service

Service of ſome Church; but this could not make either Apoſtles or Evangeliſts *reſident Officers*.

F. O. had ſaid, that *Chryſoſtom* agreed with *Euſebius*, that Evangeliſts were unfixed Church-Officers. The *Rector* here exclaims againſt *F. O's insincerity in putting the Affirmative for the Negative, that is μὲν for μὴ and leaving out μόνον.* P. 119.

He further Notes out of *Chryſoſtom*, that *Timothy and Titus were* δι καθήμενοι ϗ περὶ ἕνα τόπον, *employ'd in one Place, that is, were reſident Evangeliſts, and he tells us he has employ'd his Friends to examine all the Editions of* Chryſoſtom *in both Univerſities, and finds that nothing could lead* J. O. *into this Error but Deſign, and want of Sincerity. St.* Chryſoſtom *then muſt be acknowledg'd* (ſaith he) *on my ſide, and to have affirm'd the Evangeliſts were fixed and reſident Church-Rulers, and that* Timothy *and* Titus *were ſo.*

1. Here is a very ſevere Charge for a *Syllabical Miſtake* of the Tranſcriber of *F. O's* Copy, who put μὲν for μὴ which was overlook'd in the *Errata*. I doubt not but this Candid Gentleman has examin'd *F. O's* other Quotations, it's well he can find no more faults in a Book that contains ſome hundreds of Quotations.

2. *F. O.* did not leave μόνον out to ſerve his Cauſe, as Mr. *G.* falſly affirms, but he tranſcribed the Paſſage as he found it in the *Edition* which he had by him, which has not μόνον. *Chryſoſt. in Epiſt. Edit. Donat. Veron.* P. 163.

3. *F. O's* notion of *Evangeliſts*, that they were *unſettled Church-Officers*, needed neither *Euſebius* nor *Chryſoſtom's* Teſtimonies to confirm it, for the Hiſtory of the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts* in the *Acts* and *Epiſtles* of *Paul*, make it evident that they were ſuch, and Mr. *G.* himſelf cannot deny but there were *Itinerant Evangeliſts*, as he calls them, *P.* 118. and he owns it to be the general Opinion, which he would rectifie by his Notion of *fixed Evangeliſts*. J. O's Notion of *Evangeliſts* being grounded on the Scriptures, and agreeable to the received Opinion of the Learned, he cou'd be under no Temptation to alter μὴ into μὲν in *Chryſoſtom*, Eſpecially:

4. Having *Chrysostom* of his side, without that Alteration, Thus he, τρίτον εὐαγγελιστὰς, οἱ μὴ περιϊόντες παντακοῦ, &c. he gave, 'Thirdly Evan-'gelists who did not go about every where, but 'Preached the Gospel as *Priscilla* and *Aquilla*. Pa-'stors and Teachers were those to whose Care the 'the People were wholly committed. What then, 'were the Pastors and Teachers Inferiour? Yes, 'they who were resident and employ'd only in one 'Place, as *Timothy* and *Titus*, were altogether Inferi-'our to those that went about and Evangeliz'd. He speaks a little after of *Evangelists who wrote the Gospels*. In this Passage Note.

Chrysostom does not deny, but Evangelists did go about, he only saith, they did not go about παντακοῦ *every where*, as the Apostles did; they moved in a narrower Orb than the Apostles whose, *Messengers* and *Ministers* they were, and by whose appointment their Motions were guided and limitted.

That this is *Chrysostoms* meaning appears, 1. From the Instance of *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, which he gives, these are Evangelists with *Chrysostom*: Now these did remove from one Place to another, from *Rome* to *Corinth*, this remove was occasion'd by an Edict of *Claudius*, Acts 18. 1, 2. some time after they removed with *Paul* to *Ephesus*, ver. 18. doubtless by *Pauls* appointment, as other Evangelists did. Thus we see *Chrysostom*'s Evangelists did go up and down but not παντακοῦ, *every where* at their own Pleasure, as the Apostles did, who had no Superiours to direct their Motions, but the Evangelists removed under the Conduct of the Apostles. The Apostles were immedintely under the Conduct of the Spirit, and went about *every where*, whither the Spirit guided them: The Evangelists were under the Conduct of the Apostles, and went about also, but only to such Places and Services as the Apostles directed them.

* *See* Acts 18. 22.

Priscilla a Woman is an Evangelist in *Chrysostom**, I hope Mr. *G.* will not make a *settled Church Officer*, that is, a *Bishop* of her, for an Evangelist and a Bishop is the same with him.

Chry-

Chrysostom here seems to confess that Women went about to communicate the Doctrine of Christianity to the Women, to whom the Men had not access in the Eastern Countries. The same is affirm'd by *Clement* of *Alexandria*, who thinks the Sisters mention'd in 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. *Ministred unto the Women who kept at home, by whom the Doctrine of our Lord might enter into the Apartments of the Women, without Reprehension or evil Suspicion* *.

2. *Chrysostom* doth not reckon *Timothy* and *Titus* among *Evangelists*, but among the *Pastors* or *fixed Officers*, whom he makes Inferiour to those *that went up and down and Evangeliz'd*, i. e. *The Evangelists*.

* *Clem. Alex. Strom.* III. *vid. Constit. Apost.* III. 15. *Conc. Laod.* Can. xi. *Epiph. hær.* 79.

—— τὶ οὖν οἱ ποιμένες, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ἐλάττους; καὶ πάνυ, τῶν περώνεων, καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένων οἱ καθήμενοι καὶ περὶ ἕνα τόπον ἠσχολημένοι, οἷον τιμόθεος, τίτος. In *Eph.* 4. λογ. ιά. *Edit. Donat. Veron.*

He calls *Timothy* and *Titus fixed Pastors*, according to the received Opinion of his Age: But he rightly distinguisheth between Evangelists and Pastors, and makes the εὐαγγελιζομενοι, or Evangelists to be the same with the περῆοντες, or these that *went about* Preaching the Gospel.

Thus after all the Noise and Clamour which Mr. *G.* hath made, its evident that *Chrysostom* agrees with *Eusebius* in his Notion of Evangelists.

Their calling *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops doth not affect us, who make the Holy Scriptures the Rule of our Faith, and not the Sentiments of any fallible Men. We have prov'd from Scripture, that they were *Evangelists*, and not *Diocesan Bishops*. *Eusebius* saith only, *it is* reported that *Timothy* was the first Bishop of *Ephesus*, aud he ingeniously acknowledges, that they had no certainty, who succeeded the Apostles in the Government of the Churches planted by them, those only excepted who are mentioned in *Paul*'s Epistles. It is fit therefore we shou'd be determin'd in this Point by the Writings of the New Testament.

Hist. III. 4.

Its well obſerv'd by the Learned Biſhop of *Worceſter*, that the firſt that call'd *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus* was *Leontius* Biſhop of *Magneſia* in the Council of *Chalcedon*. This was four hundred Years after, in which time Records being loſt, and Biſhops being after ſetled there, no doubt they would begin the Succeſſion with *Timothy*, becauſe of his Imployment there once for ſetling the Churches thereabout. He adds, that this was not the Act of the Council, but of a ſingle Perſon, delivering his Private Opinion in it, and that by the by too, and he was contradicted in the Face of the Council, for ſaying, that the Biſhops of *Epheſus* had all of them been ordain'd upon the Place.

See more in that Learned Author, who judiciouſly Confutes their Opinion, who make *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*. Dr. *Stillingfleet Iren.* p. 302, 303. The Fathers call the Apoſtles Biſhops, which all grant they were not in a proper Sence. *Epiphanius* ſaith, that *Peter* and *Paul* were both of them Apoſtles and Biſhops at *Rome*. *Epiph. hæreſ.* xxvii. The Fathers therefore, when they call Apoſtles or Apoſtolical Men Biſhops, ſpeak in the Language of their time, and are not to be taken in a ſtrict Sence.

Having gone through his Book, and diſcovered the fallacies of his Reaſonings, it were needleſs to take Notice of his laſt Chapter, which he calls an Anſwer to *J. O's.* Plea, in which there is ſcarce any thing, which has not been conſider'd already. Yet for the ſake of the more Ignorant Reader, I will make ſome ſhort replies to his Anſwers.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Pariſh-Diſcipline. Presbyters have Power of Government. 1. J. O's. *Firſt Argument for Ordination by Presbyters*, viz. *The Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters acknowledged.* 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Conſider'd.* 1 Tim. 1. 3. *doth not prove* Timothy *Biſhop of* Epheſus. *Dr.* Whittaker *Vindicated.* Ignatius's *One Altar Explain'd. The extent of the Church of* Epheſus. *An Objection Anſwer'd.* Rev. 5. 11. *Vindicated. Dr.* Lightfoot's *Notion of Angel Vindicated.* 2. J. O's. *Second and Third Argument for Ordination by Presbyters Vindicated. Presbyters ſucceed the Apoſtles.* Ignatius *and* Ireneus *Vindicated. More Teſtimonies to the ſame effect.*

HE Charges *J. O. with reflecting on Epiſcopal Ordination*, but gives no Inſtance of any ſuch *Reflection*, which doubtleſs he would have done, if he had been able. Let this paſs among his other Calumnies. P. 122.

His *Crambe* about *Jerom* and *Ignatius* has been conſider'd before: It were endleſs to tire my Reader and my ſelf with nauſeous Repetitions, as often as this Author gives occaſion. P. 123.

He falls foully upon *J. O.* for ſaying that *Pariſh-Prieſts have no Power of Diſcipline*, which I have proved. They have Power of *Diſcipline*, ſaith he, *becauſe all the Canons, or Laws of the Church, are* P. 125, 126.

made by the Priests of the Church of England, *as well as by the Bishops.*

1. Their *Executive* Power is the same with their *Legislative* Power, that is, none at all. The Acts of Convocation are no *Laws*, till they be Confirmed in Parliament.

2. Hath every Parish-Priest a power of making Church-Laws? If not, this Instance is impertinently brought in, to prove that the Parish-Priests have Power of Discipline. If it be said they make Laws by their Representatives; so do the People of *England* by their Representatives in Parliament: Doth it follow therefore, that every Free-holder hath the Power of Governing? Though the Truth is, the Convocation is not a Just Representative of the Clergy. For in the Convocation for the Province of *Canterbury*, there are but 44 Clerks representing the Clergy; the Bishops, Deans, Prebendaries and Arch-Deacons, make up 122. The Arch-Deacons, who are the Bishops Creatures, as being chosen solely by them, are 10 in Number more than the Clerks: so that the Clerks are little more than Cyphers in Convocation, there are enough in the lower House to out-vote them, besides an upper House of Bishops, who have sometimes a considerable Influence in the Election of the very Clerks.

3. The Rector may please himself with his Power of making new Laws, all the Power we plead for is, a Liberty for Parish-Ministers to execute the Laws of Christ, in the exclusion of the Scandalous, and the admission of such as are duly qualify'd for Gospel-Ordinances.

The Parish-Ministers, or *Priests*, as he calls them, (and yet is unreasonably angry with us for calling them so) *have Power to Reprove, and Suspend for a Time.*

We had this before in the Preface. A Private Person may Reprove; they can Suspend from the Lord's Supper for a time, *i. e.* till the next Return of the Carrier, or about 14 Days, and then they are obliged to deliver up all to the Ordinary; with whom

whom the Offender often *commutes* for his Crime, and returns as *Impenitent* as he went (except he *repent* that he has parted with ſo much Money:) When he has made his Peace with the Ordinary, or his Commiſſary, or Chancellor, the Miniſter muſt admit him, or be proceeded againſt himſelf, for diſobeying his Superiours.

Is their any Preſident for this in the Goſpel? Did Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, Eſtabliſh this ſort of Diſcipline?

Mr. *G.* Challenges *J. O. to prove out of Scripture, That ever any Ordinary Presbyters did Excommunicate.* P. 126.

We have but few Inſtances of Excommunication in Scripture; but we have proved already, That the *Corinthian Presbyters*, and conſequently *all others*, had Power to Judge, *i. e.* to *decree Excommunicated*, (as the Rector explains it) thoſe that are within, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. See *Rom.* 16. 17. 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 6.

Can the Rector, who ſo liberally demands Scripture-Proofs, give us any Inſtance of Preſbyters Suſpending for a *Fortnight*? If he can find no Proof in Scripture, That *ordinary Presbyters did Suſpend at all* from the Communion, how dare they do it *for a Fortnight*? If he finds by Scripture they may Suſpend, how dare he condemn our Preſbyters for Suſpending Perſons until they ſee ſome evidences of their Repentance?

But ſince he calls for *Proofs*, let him ſhew us ſome Proof out of Scripture for the Power of *Lay-Chancellors* to Excommunicate? or ſome Inſtance of *commuting Penance* for a Sum of Money. I have read in Scripture of the Prieſts *eating up the ſin of the People, and ſetting their Heart on their Iniquity*, Hoſh. 4. 8. The Covetous Prieſts then got a ſmall ſhare out of the Sacrifices occaſioned by the *ſins* of the People, *Lev.* 6. 26. & 10. 17. but our *Commuters* ingroſs the whole Offering to themſelves.

It is odd to hear a Man call for *Scripture-Proof*, who cannot pretend to any *Scripture-Proof* for abundance of things which they Practice, and Impoſe as

as Conditions of Communion on Miniſters and People. This Gentleman has a meaſure and a meaſure, that is, a *double meaſure*, one for himſelf and Brethren, and another for the *Diſſenters*. Were he willing to be determined by the Scripture, as he pretends, our Controverſies would be ſoon at an end.

Ibid. He ignorantly affirms, That the Preſbyterian Biſhops (as he calls them) *are at beſt but the Executioners of the Lay-Elders Will.*

I know but very few of the Congregations call'd *Presbyterian*, that have any *Ruling Elders* at all; and thoſe that have, receive them only as *Aſſiſtants* to the Miniſters, and not as *Rulers Superiour* to them.

J. O's. Firſt Argument, to prove that Preſbyters may Ordain, is becauſe they are *Scripture-Biſhops. Pleа*, p. 12, 13. He proves the Identity of Biſhops and Preſbyters in the New Teſtament times, and ſome Ages after.

To this Argument the *Rector* anſwers:

P. 126, 127. 1. He grants *they were the ſame in the New Teſtament, and were the Ordinary Rulers of the Church, but* Timothy *and* Titus *were above them.*

Nothing but the brightneſs of Truth could extort ſuch a Confeſſion from him; for,

1. If Preſbyters and Biſhops were the ſame in the New Teſtament, let him ſhew us who had Power afterwards to diſtinguiſh them.

2. If they be the ſame, they have the ſame Powers. Therefore if the Biſhop has Power to Ordain, ſo has the Preſbyter: If the Presbyter has no ſuch Power, no more has the Biſhop.

Thus he has kindly *Eſtabliſhed our Argument*; but I hope his Epiſcopal Friends will not impute it to any *ill deſign* in him, for he is full of good Will to their *Cauſe*, and it is their own fault that they have choſen no better an *Advocate*.

3. But he hopes to come off, by ſaying that *Timothy* and *Titus* were above the Preſbyters or Biſhops, for hereafter you muſt take them for *one and the ſame.*

Timothy

Timothy and *Titus*, Evangeliſts, were above the *Biſhops*. What then? It is as natural to infer thence, That Presbyters are above Biſhops, as that Biſhops are above Preſbyters.

Not only *Evangeliſts*, but *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* were Superiour to Ordinary Miniſters. But no Example has been yet produced, that one Ordinary Miniſter was Superiour to another Ordinary Miniſter. No inſtance can be given in the New Teſtament of any one meer Preſbyter that was Superiour to another Preſbyter.

If there muſt be ſome Church-Officers, called Biſhops, Superiour to Preſbyters, becauſe Evangeliſts were ſo; by the ſame reaſon there ought to be ſome Church-Officers Superiour to Biſhops, becauſe the Prophets were Superiour to the Evangeliſts; and another ſort of Church-Officers Superiour to them alſo, becauſe the Apoſtles were Superiour to the Prophets.

He Subſcribes to *F. O's.* Aſſertion, That there were *ſeveral Biſhops in one Church in the Apoſtles Days, and that thoſe mention'd in Scripture, were not of our Engliſh Species.* P. 128.

Therefore by his own Confeſſion, Engliſh Biſhops are not Scripture-Biſhops.

But there was an Order of Church-Officers above theſe Presbyter-Biſhops, ſaith he, *as we have demonſtrated in the Churches of* Crete *and* Epheſus.

There were no leſs than three Orders above them, that is, *Apoſtles*, *Prophets*, and *Evangeliſts*, each of them extraordinary Church-Officers, *Eph.* 4. 11. deſign'd for the Planting of the Chriſtian Church, as the ordinary Paſtors and Teachers were appointed for the propagating of it unto the end of Time.

The Foundations were to be laid by thoſe extraordinary Church-Officers, the Superſtructure to be carried on, according to the Platform they left us, by ordinary Officers.

F. O. Prov'd out of *Juſtin Martyr*, and the *Syriac Verſion* of the New Teſtament, That Biſhop and Preſbyter were the ſame in the Ages after the Apoſtles,

ſtles, *P.* 13, 14. This the Rector prudently overlooks.

He thus Paraphraſeth on 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *They who*
P. 129. *Rule well, and alſo labour in the Word and Doctrine, deſerve better than they only who Rule well, but don't withal labour in the Word and Doctrine.*

Here he ſuppoſes that ſome in the Church may Rule well, who don't Labour in the Word and Doctrine: But *who are theſe?* He will not ſay *Biſhops*, for then the *Presbyter*, who Rules well, and Labours in the Word and Doctrine, is worthy of more Honour than the *Biſhop*; that he will not like: There remains no other but the Preſbyterians *Ruling Elder*, whom he vindicates by his kind Paraphraſe. Had this Gentleman been *retain'd* by them, he could not better have pleaded their Cauſe.

P. 130. *And although the Elders*, proceeds he, *received a Commiſſion from St.* Paul, *and* Peter, ἐπισκοπεῖν, (Acts 20. 28. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2.) *will it thence follow, that there was none to Over-rule them? Or does it hence appear, That theſe Elders had Power to Ordain?*

1. It hence follows they were *real Biſhops*, as he has confeſſed; and if Ordination be a Branch of Epiſcopal Power, as he ſaith it is, theſe Elders had Power to Ordain.

2. It hence follows, that theſe Preſbyters were the Supream Ordinary Church-Rulers, if Biſhops be ſuch. The extraordinary Superiour Rulers were Temporary.

Ibid. He dare almoſt Swear it, that ἐπισκοπεῖν implies not the Ordaining Power. *Verily*, ſaith he, *If this be ſo, every Believer hath the ſame Power, for they are bid,* ἐπισκοπεῖν, *to play the Biſhops*; or, as we Tranſlate it —— to look diligently, leſt any Man fail of the Grace of God, *Heb.* 12. 15.

Are all Believers bid, ἐπισκοπεῖν, to look diligently to the Flock, as the Paſtors of it? If they be not, this Allegation is impertinent.

Ibid. He ſaith *the ordinary Elders had not the Supreme Authority over the Churches, after the time we have aſſign'd, nor did they ever Ordain Elders.*

This

This implies, That the Ordinary Elders had the *Supreme Authority* before the time he aſſign'd, and it is certain the Elders of *Epheſus* had it in *Acts* 20. 28. He cannot prove they were ever depriv'd of it. We have prov'd that they had the Supream Authority after the Writing of the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*.

We have alſo prov'd out of *Acts* 13. 1, 2. and 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. That ordinary Elders did Ordain, and have Vindicated thoſe Texts from his corrupt Gloſſes.

F. O. obſerved that the Apoſtles does not mention Superiour Biſhops in his Catalogue of Goſpel-Miniſters, *Eph.* 4. 11. *Ibid.*

Mr. *G.* Aſſigns this for a Reaſon: *Biſhops, as a diſtinct Species of Church-Officers, were not as yet eſtabliſhed. The* Itenerant, *or unfix'd Evangeliſts, Govern'd the Churches under the Apoſtles, and Ordain'd Elders for 'em.*

1. Here is a fair Confeſſion, there were no *Biſhops in the Chriſtian Churches*, when the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* was written, which was in *Paul's* Firſt Bonds at *Rome*. We have prov'd that the Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written before his Firſt Bonds, and ſo *Timothy* could be no Biſhop of *Epheſus*.

2. The Church of *Epheſus* was Govern'd by Presbyters, *Acts* 20. 28. without either Evangeliſt or Apoſtle to over-ſee them, that we read of. The Apoſtle commits the Flock wholly and ſolely to them, when he parted with them, having no thoughts of ever ſeeing them again, *v.* 25.

3. He grants that Evangeliſts were unfix'd Officers under the Apoſtles, and Ordain'd Elders; as ſuch, *Timothy* and *Titus* might Ordain Elders in *Epheſus* and *Crete*, as *unfix'd Evangeliſts*, for ſuch they were after the Epiſtles written to them, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9, 21. *Tit.* 3. 12. 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. Therefore thoſe Epiſtles do not make them *fixed Governours*, as he ſuppoſeth.

F. O. took notice that the *Papiſts* urge the Inſtances of *Timothy* and *Titus*, for Superiour Biſhops againſt

againſt the *Proteſtants*, and that the Biſhops beſt Arguments have been dextrouſly manag'd againſt the whole Reformation. What can the Rector ſay to this? Matter of Fact is ſo plain that he cannot deny it, and therefore endeavours to palliate it as well as he can.

P. 131. *F. O.* ſays he, *in this very Book has made uſe of the Popiſh School-Men*, p. 55. 107. and therefore *I cannot avoid taxing him with great Inſincerity and Partiality.*

The Rector's Invention runs low, that he can find nothing but the old, dull, thred-bare charge of *Inſincerity*, which we have had over and over. But the comfort of it is, his Tongue is no Slander. All the difference between *F. O's.* Arguments out of the Popiſh Doctors, and Mr. *G's.* Arguments out of them is this:

1. He treads in their Steps without once naming them; *F. O.* names them all along, when he makes uſe of them.

2. *F. O.* Quotes the Popiſh Doctors, againſt themſelves, and for the Reformed Churches, who moſt of them have no Biſhops; and all will allow, that the *Teſtimony of an Adverſary is good againſt himſelf*: Mr. *G.* improves their Arguments againſt the Reformed Churches, whom *they* and *he* condemn as no Churches, for want of Ordaining Biſhops. The Rector is too cunning to deliver the Concluſion in expreſs Words, but he lays down, and endeavours to eſtabliſh thoſe Premiſſes, that neceſſarily infer this concluſion, That Popiſh Ordinations are valid, and, that all the Ordinations of the Reformed Churches (except thoſe in *England* and *Ireland* by Biſhops) are a Nullity. This is the deſign of his Book, in which he pretends to prove, That no ordinary *Presbyter hath Power to Ordain*, and that no *Inſtance can be given in all the New Teſtament of any Ordaining Presbyter*; and that Biſhops *are Superiour to Presbyters by a Divine Right.* The Truth is, the Performance is as *weak*, as the Undertaking is *bold.*

I leave it to the Reader to Judge, who is to be charged

charged with *Infincerity*, one that Defends the Reformed Churches againſt the Popiſh Writers, tho' he quotes them ſometimes againſt themſelves; or one who under the Name of a *Proteſtant*, joyns with the Popiſh Church and Doctors, in deſtroying the Miniſtry of the greateſt part of the *Proteſtant Reformed Churches*.

Since we like not Popiſh Arguments, *one thing he will be bold to tell* J. O. *that he will here meet with an Argument borrowed from Biſhop* Pearſon, *which he thinks neither any Papiſt, nor* J. O. *himſelf ever thought of before.* P. 132.

Who *ſo bold as blind* Bayard? This Man boldly tells us, That no *Papiſt* ever thought of Biſhop *Pearſon*'s Argument, drawn from the time of Writing the Epiſtles to *Timothy*, &c. I ſhewed before that the *Seminary* at *Rhemes* thought of the Biſhop's Argument before he was born.

The *Rector* has a great many Qualities that are very ſingular, this among others, That when he is remoteſt from Truth, he is then moſt confident.

He thinks J. O. *never thought of this Argument before.* His *Memory* is as defective as his *Reading*. J. O. told him before his Book was talk'd of, that he had thought of this Argument, and had prepared a Diſſertation to Vindicate the Old Chronology. Some Gentlemen that were then preſent, may relieve his Memory, if need be.

J. O. Argued, that thoſe Words, *Lay hands ſuddenly on no Man*, do not prove the ſole Power of Ordination in *Timothy*.

To this he anſwers, *It ought to be hence concluded, that the ſole Power of Ordination was in* Timothy, *till* J. O. *can produce a like Commiſſion given to the Presbyters.* P. 133.

That has been proved from *Acts* 13. 1, 2. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.

He adds, *J. O's. Reaſon is a very pleaſant one, it may as well follow* (ſaith *J. O.*) *that the ſole Power of Teaching belongs to him, becauſe the Apoſtle bids him be inſtant in Preaching the Word. By no means,* ſaith

ſaith Mr. *G. becauſe the Apoſtle directs him expreſly to appoint other Teachers.* 2 Tim. 22. *We deſire to ſee ſome like Paſſages of other Ordainers, beſide* Timothy.

The Apoſtle, or rather the Holy Ghoſt, appointed ſeveral Biſhops in *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20. 28. If the Power of Ordination belongs to Biſhops as ſuch, theſe *Epheſian* Biſhops were Ordainers. It is an old, and a true Maxim, *Quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia.*

2. But leſt we ſhould want other Ordainers, he'l furniſh us with ſome from 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. which tho' his Argument inclines him to underſtand it of Teachers at preſent, yet in another Mood he explains it of Ordainers, *p.* 53.

F. O. prov'd that *Timothy* could not receive the ſole Power of Ordination, becauſe *Paul* himſelf took in the Preſbyters, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.

To this the Rector ſaith, *It is ſomething to the purpoſe, if it were well prov'd.* 1 Tim. 4. 14. *has been fully diſcuſs'd already*, ſaith he. And fully Vindicated ſay I, from his Self-Contradicting-Exceptions.

F. O. Gives another Reaſon to prove that *Timothy* could not be entruſted with the ſole Power of Ordination, becauſe *Paul* Join'd *Barnabas* with him, *Acts* 14. 23.

Ibid. The Rector Anſwers, *The Miſchief is*, Barnabas *was* Paul's *equal, and an Apoſtle as well as himſelf*, Acts 14. 4. 14.

Many think *Barnabas* was not *Paul*'s equal; that he was properly an Evangeliſt *. Evangeliſts were Secondary Apoſtles, *Apoſtoli vicarii*, as ſome call them. They ſeem to be included in Apoſtles, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. compar'd with *Eph.* 4. 11.

* *Vid. Sad. ad Tur. Soph.* p. 783.

'Tis true, he is call'd an *Apoſtle*, *Acts* 14. 4. 14. ſo are others, who were not Apoſtles in a ſtrict Senſe, *Rom.* 16. 7. 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. *Phil.* 2. 25.

2. But ſuppoſe he were an Apoſtle in a ſtrict Senſe, and *Paul*'s equal, *F. O*'s. Argument ſtill holds good. If *Paul* and Apoſtle, Join'd *Barnabas* with him,

him, another Apoſtle, or Evangeliſt; it's not likely that *Timothy* would Ordain alone, but that he join'd the Biſhops of *Epheſus* with him. If an *Apoſtle* would not lay on Hands alone, much leſs would an *Evangeliſt*.

'*Tis but* J. O's. *Dream*, ſays he, *when he talks of other ordinary Presbyters Ordaining with theſe two Apoſtles. I deſire to ſee this made out by any tolerable Conjecture.* P. 134.

1. *F. O.* did not affirm that Preſbyters Ordain'd with *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts* 14. 23. becauſe it is uncertain whether there were any in theſe Churches before this time.

2. But if there were any, 'tis probable they join'd in the action, as they did in *Timothy*'s Ordination, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. which may ground a probable Conjecture.

Paul's intention to go to Epheſus, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. & 4. 13. *hinders not* Timothy *from being the Reſident Biſhop there, as he thinks.* *Ibid.*

1. His intention of going ſhortly to *Epheſus*, ſhews the inconſiſtency of Mr. G's. Hypotheſis; for he told us before (*p.* 90.) *That the Apoſtle Govern'd the Church of* Epheſus *himſelf by the Presbyters in his abſence*, who were reſponſible to him. *This continued ſo long*, ſaith he, *as he was vigorous and active, and had opportunity to over-ſee both the Flock and the Elders themſelves.* And now he tells us, That this Church was Govern'd by a Biſhop, when the Apoſtle was both able and reſolved to overſee it.

2. He told us before that the Presbyters *were reſponſible to* Paul, and now he makes *Timothy reſponſible* to him. Nothing can be inferr'd from their being ſubject to *Paul*, that does not equally affect *Timothy*.

3. If *Paul*'s going to *Timothy* does not hinder his being Reſident at *Epheſus*, I hope *Timothy*'s going to *Paul* doth, 2 *Tim.* 4. 21. Except the Rector can prove that *Timothy* had an *ubiquitarian* Body. If he ſaith he return'd again in a little time to *Ephe-*

ſus, he ought to prove it; which he can never do from the Writings of the Apoſtles.

Ibid. He chargeth *F. O.* with foiſting the Words *till he came*, into 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. This Charge is as groundleſs as it is diſingenuous; for *F. O.* did not quote the Words of Scripture, but gave the meaning of it in theſe Words:

" *Paul* did not injoyn *Timothy* to be reſident at " *Epheſus*, but beſought him to abide there till he " came, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. & 4. 13, 14. which he intend- " ed ſhortly to do, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15.

The Joyning of the Scriptures together, and the Explaining of one Scripture by another, will be allow'd by any one that does not ſeek occaſions of quarrelling.

Till I come, beſpeaks a Temporary Stay at *Epheſus*, for he was beſought by *Paul* to ſupply his abſence there; when the Apoſtle came in Perſon, there was no need of a *Subſtitute*.

Whether *Timothy* went from *Epheſus* to *Paul*, or whether *Paul* went from *Macedonia* to *Epheſus*, it's one and the ſame thing, his Work there was *Temporary*, and became unneceſſary, when the Apoſtle was with him.

Thus *Paul* ſent him not long before this to *Macedonia*, and ſometime after follow'd him thither, *Acts* 19. 21, 22. In like manner he deſign'd to follow him to *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14.

The Rector takes for granted what he ſhould have prov'd, That *Timothy* was obliged to perpetual Reſidence at *Epheſus*, which has not been yet proved. He calls him away, 2 *Tim.* 4. 21. and ſo he doth *Titus* from *Crete*, *Tit.* 3. 12.

All that hath been hitherto urged for his perpetual Reſidence at *Epheſus*, is that in 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *I beſought thee to abide ſtill at* Epheſus. Theſe words do not look like the Inſtalling of a Biſhop in his Dioceſs: προσμένειν ſignifies frequently, a ſhort abode, *Mat.* 15. 32. *Mark* 8. 2. *Timothy* is ſaid to

abide

abide ſtill at Athens, when his ſtay was very ſhort there, *Acts* 17. 14. 15.

He calls upon us to prove that *Timothy* was Furniſhed with the ſame Powers at *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Theſſalonica*, &c. P. 135.

I will prove it from his own Confeſſion, *p.* 130. *The unfix'd Evangeliſts Govern'd the Churches under the Apoſtles, and Ordain'd Elders for 'em*: Thus he. Here he aſcribes the Power of *Governing and Ordaining* unto the unfix'd Evangeliſts; and yet has the Confidence to *require us to prove it.*

Whereas then, ſaith he, *Paul beſought him to abide and reſide at* Epheſus, *and we never find him in the Apoſtle's Company again, nor in any other place after; we muſt take him for the Reſident Evangeliſt or Biſhop here, until* J. O. *ſhall pleaſe to tell us out of Sacred or Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, whither he removed.* Ibid.

I will ſhew him that *Timothy* was in *Paul's Company, and in another place, after* Paul *beſought him to abide at* Epheſus. In order to which I deſire him to grant this reaſonable Suppoſition, *viz.* That the Second Epiſtle to him was Written after the Firſt.

In the Firſt Epiſtle *Paul* ſaid he beſought him to ſtay at *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. In the Secod Epiſtle he calls him to *Rome*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9, 21. Doubtleſs he went thither, according to the Apoſtle's Order, and we find him there with the Apoſtle, when he wrote his Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, *Phil.* 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. *Philem.* 1. In like manner he ſends for *Titus* from *Crete* to *Nicopolis*, *Tit.* 3. 12, and afterwards ſends him to *Dalmatia*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10.

Thus we have told him, in compliance with his deſires, out of *Sacred Hiſtory*, That not only *Timothy*, but *Titus* alſo, removed, the former to *Rome*, the latter to *Nicopolis* and *Dalmatia*.

As to *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, we have little certain concerning *Timothy*, or any other of the Apoſtle's Survivors and Succeſſors, as *Euſebius* obſerves *. * *Hiſt.* III. 4.

He ſaith of *Timothy*, *It is reported* he was Biſhop of *Epheſus*.

But other Hiſtorians ſay, He removed from *Epheſus*, and came into *Britain*, and Baptized King *Lucius*, and his Subjects, and removed hence to *Curie* in *Germany*, where he was Biſhop, and died a Martyr.

This is reported by grave Authors, *Nauclerus*, *Petrus de Natalibus*, *Pantaleon de viris Illuſtrib. Germ.* &c.

Nauclerus, ſaith he, finds this Recorded in the Legend of St. *Thomas* the Apoſtle, which agrees with the Legend of St. *Lucius*, which is to be found among the Records of the Church of *Curie* *.

* *Chron.* Vol. II. *Gen.* 6. p. 472.

I do not pretend to warrant for the Truth of this Account. There may be ſome Truths, though intermix'd with Fables, even in a Legend. Arch-Biſhop *Uſher*, that great Antiquary, quotes this Story, in his *Britan. Eccleſ. Primord. Cap.* 3.

It may not be improbable but *Timothy* might Preach in theſe Countries, if *Paul* was here, as the Rector ſeems to allow, *p.* 90. For *Timothy* was his Companion in moſt of his Travels, and *Served with him in the Goſpel, as a Son with the Father*, Phil. 2. 22.

F. O. oppoſed Dr. *Whittaker*, the Learned *Cambridge* Profeſſor, and Maul of Popery, to *Bellarmine*, who grounds *Timothy*'s Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, upon 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. *Againſt an Elder receive not an Accuſation.* The Dr. ſaith, *That to receive an Accuſation, is to acquaint the Church with the Crime, which Equals and Inferiors may do.*

The Rector has two or three Pages in Confutation of Dr. *Whittaker*, the Sum of which is, That if *Timothy was only to acquaint the Church with it, he was no better than an Informer, or Proſecutor.*

p. 135, 136, 137, 138.

He might be an Eccleſiaſtical Judge, though he acted in Conjunction with the Church, as *Paul* did in Excommunicating the Inceſtuous *Corinthian*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. The Doctor doth not deny him

him to be Superiour to the Elders, as he was an Evangelist, but shews the invalidity of the Argument drawn from his *receiving Accusations*.

F. O. shew'd (*p.* 21.) that the Presbyters and the People may receive an Accusation against their Bishop, and Instanced in *Epithetus*, and the People of *Assura*, to whom *Cyprian* writes not to admit *Fortunatianus* to be Bishop again, because he had denied the Faith. He instanceth also in the Clergy and People of *Spain*, who rejected *Basilides* and *Martialis*, their Bishops, because they had Sacrificed to Idols.

The *Rector* wisely over-looks all this, and proceeds to another Argument.

F. O. Asks how comes *Paul* to promise to come shortly to *Ephesus*, if he had settled a Successor there?

Mr. *G.* Answers, this is a *trifling Objection, and makes equally against the Presbyters of* Ephesus, Acts 20. 28. *Who ever thought* Timothy *so absolute, as not to be subject to St.* Paul?

When this Gentleman gives a diminutive Epithet to our Arguments, understand him by the Rule of Contraries. You may perceive by his Uneasiness that he is Gravell'd, and would relieve himself by a big Word, which may disparage an Argument with unthinking People.

1. This *trifling Objection*, as he calls it, shews how groundless his Hypothesis is, That *Paul* settled *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, when he could over-see the Church no longer.

2. It shews the weakness of his Reasonings, That the Elders had no Episcopal Power, because they were subject to the Apostles. The Scope of a great part of his Book, is to prove that the Presbyters were not Supream Governours, because the Apostles were above them. See *P.* 38, 39, 40, 41. He does in the same place affirm, *Timothy* and *Titus* to be Supream Governours. Here he forgets all

his former Reaſonings, and acknowledges *Timothy* Subject to *Paul*.

Either *Timothy* was no Supreme Governour or Biſhop, becauſe he was Subject to *Paul*, or the Preſbyters of *Epheſus* might be *Supream Governours*, notwithſtanding their Subjection to him.

P. 139. 3. What he adds, *of his viſiting his Neighbour Presbyter, without claiming any Power over him and his Flock*, is very impertinent; for an *Apoſtolical Viſitation*, was ſomething different from a private Viſit from one Neighbour to another.

I hope he will allow it to be as Solemn as any *Epiſcopal Viſitation*. I might return his own Words upon him, *But ſuch Stuff as this does our Author impoſe upon his Friends, and needleſsly troubles his Adverſaries with*, but I ſhall forbear. *Ibid.*

He thinks that the *Church of* Epheſus *conſiſted of many Congregations*, though he agree that it *conſiſted not of two hundred or three hundred Pariſhes or Corgregations, as our Dioceſſes do*. *Ibid.*

Here we have his own Confeſſion, That the Modern Dioceſſes are very different from that of *Epheſus*, and other Ancient Dioceſſes.

P. 140. That there were more Congregations than one, he proves from the *Jus Divinum Miniſterii Anglicani*.

1. Suppoſe there were two or three Congregations in *Epheſus*, as the *London* Miniſters conceive there might be more than one, what is two or three, to two or three hundred? It can never be prov'd, there were more Chriſtians in *Epheſus*, in *Timothy*'s, or if you will in *Ignatius* his time, than are in ſome of our great Pariſhes, which contains ſome *Ten*, ſome *Twenty*, ſome *Thirty Thouſand* Souls.

2. Some of our larger Pariſhes have ſeveral Chapels, ſome three, ſome four, ſome ſix: He knows a Pariſh in his Neighbourhood * that has Seven or Eight: Will he ſay that a *Rector*, who has ſeveral Curates under him, is a *Dioceſan* Biſhop.

* *Manchester.*

I hear the Rector's Parish has four or five Chapels in it.

He thinks the *number of Cities, or great Towns in* Crete *was extraordinary, because* Florus *calls it a Noble Island.* His Proof is a little *extraordinary.* Must every Noble Island have an extraordinary number of Cities? P. 142.

Well, but to do him a kindness, I will tell him the number of the most considerable Cities or Towns in *Crete.*

Pliny, who lived in *Vespasian*'s time, saith there were about Fourty Famous Towns in *Crete*, and the Memory of about Fourty more *. But let the Cities of it be more or less, it is all one to my Argument: We have proved *Titus* already to be an Evangelist, and the number of Cities he was to Ordain Elders in is a Confirmation of it. For by his own Confession, *Crete* has had in it, at one time, Four Arch-Bishops, and Twenty one Bishops †. And now we are upon this Subject, let's see the extent of their Bishopricks. He tells us out of Dr. *Heylin*, *There were* 207 *Parishes in* Crete; which divided between twenty five Bishops, there falls but Eight Parishes to the share of each Bishop, and an over-plus of $\frac{7}{25}$ Parts. * *Nat. Hist.* 4. 12. † P. 142.

How different were these from Modern Bishopricks? A Bishop may better Over-see Eight or Nine Parishes, than Eight or Nine Scores of Parishes.

Ans. 0. Proved that the Church of *Ephesus* consisted of no more Members than could ordinarily meet in one place, because that Church had but *one Altar*, at which the whole Congregation ordinarily Receiv'd the Lord's Supper, in *Ignatius* his time.

Mr. *G.* Answers, That *Ignatius's one Altar, signifies not one Numerical, but one Specifical Altar.* P. 143.

Then *Ignatius*'s one Bishop, must signifie not one Numerical, but one *Specifical* Bishop.

Ibid. He thinks *there was more than one Numerical Altar, becauſe after the Words Alledged by* J. O. Ignatius *goes on thus: Let that Euchariſt be accounted good and firm, which is Celebrated under the Biſhop, or which he conſents to.*

Under the Biſhop, is plainly in his preſence (and *not under his Authority*, as he explains it) as being oppoſed to his Conſent in his abſence.

His conſenting that the Preſbyters might Adminiſter in his abſence, doth not prove more than one Altar. The Parſon of one Pariſh (which hath but one Altar) may conſent that his Curates may Adminiſter the Euchariſt.

He further proves there were many Altars under *Ignatius* his Biſhop, from that Paſſage —— *Wherever the Biſhop appears, there let the People be, even as where Jeſus Chriſt is*, (not *appears*, as he falſly renders ἦ) *there is the Catholick Church.*

Nothing could have been produced more impertinently than this Paſſage, which ſhews that the Multitude muſt be where the Biſhop was, or appear'd; his Appearance muſt be underſtood of his *perſonal, viſible Appearance.* To talk of an Inviſible Appearance is ridiculous.

And yet you muſt underſtand it ſo, ſaith our Author; *It is not to be underſtood of his Perſon*, but Authority, ſaith he, even *as Jeſus Chriſt is with the Catholick Church, not in his Perſon, but in his Spiritual Power.*

1. This is worſe and worſe; *Ignatius* did not ſay, Where Chriſt appears, as he to ſerve a Deſign falſly renders ὅπου ἂν ᾖ χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, but *where Jeſus Chriſt is. Ignatius* knew Jeſus Chriſt to be Inviſible on Earth, ſince his Aſcenſion, and that a Biſhop was viſible; and therefore ſaith, *where the Biſhop appears* (φανῇ) and *where Chriſt is.*

2. To deny Chriſt to be perſonally preſent with his Church, is to deny him to be the Second Perſon in the Trinity. I hope he believes the Divinity and Omnipreſence of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, though in

in a Tranſport of Zeal he forgot the Form of Sound Words. The Spiritual Power of Chriſt doth not exclude his Perſonal Preſence.

Some Men will talk any thing, though never ſo little to the purpoſe, rather than yield to the Evidence of Truth. He tells us that the *Church of* P. 145.
Epheſus, *took in all* Aſia (*the proper*) *becauſe all they that dwelt in* Aſia, *heard the Word of the Lord Jeſus*, viz. *at Epheſus.*

He might as well have ſaid, That the Church of *Jeruſalem* took in the *Parthians*, and Dwellers in *Meſopotamia*, *Cappadocia*, *Pontus* and *Aſia*, &c. for thoſe heard the Word of the Lord Jeſus at *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* 2. 9, 11.

He ſaith *J. O. ſhould have Enter'd the Liſts with* P. 146.
Dr. Maurice, *who Anſwer'd Mr.* B. *and Mr.* Cl. *about the extent of Biſhopricks.*

J. O's. Subject being Ordination, he was not concern'd in Dr. *Maurice*'s Book, though he ſaid ſomething occaſionally concerning the Extent of Churches, from *Ignatius*, and others. He complains *J. O. hath troubled them with a New Book up-* *Ibid.*
on an Old Subject, without adding any thing conſiderable to it.

It ſeems *J. O*'s. Book hath created ſome trouble to them, but what is the trouble? Is it that he writes a *New Book upon an Old Subject?* That cannot be it; for the Rector hath done ſo himſelf. If it be a fault to write upon an Old Subject, no Man muſt write at all, for there is ſcarce any thing New under the Sun. Or does it trouble him that *J. O. hath not added any thing conſiderable to the Subject*; that cannot be alſo, except we ſuppoſe his own Performance, (which has little of Addition to what is found in *Bellarmine*, and other Popiſh Authors,) to be a Trouble to him. I doubt then, ſomething elſe in the Book troubles him. He can tell what it is, for he had good Reaſon why he would not Anſwer a Book which he undertakes to Anſwer, but contents himſelf with a few

ſlight

ſlight Remarks upon two or three Chapters, and leaves the greateſt part of the Book untouch'd.

I leave it to ſuch as have read other Authors upon the Subject of Ordination by Preſbyters, to Judge of *F. O*'s. performance, whether the Subject has receiv'd any Improvement by it.

P. 146, 147, 148, 149. He takes a great deal of Pains to prove what no Body denies, *viz.* That ὅλη τὸ αὐτὸ ſignifies ſometimes Agreement or Unity, and not always one place, as *F. O.* render'd it in thoſe Words of *Ignatius*, σπεδάζετε —— *give diligence to Aſſemble together* (συνέρχεσθαι) *more frequently* —— *for when ye often come together, or into one place, the Powers of Sathan are deſtroy'd.*

ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γινεσθε —— *Ign. ad Eph.* p. 25.

One would think *F. O*'s. Tranſlation very natural, for συνέρχεσθαι refers to one place, and ſo muſt ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, which follows immediately after. But it ought not to be ſo render'd here, ſaith our Author: And the Proof is, *There might have been ſeveral Places for Worſhip at* Epheſus, *p.* 148. But he does not prove there were ſeveral places. I have proved the contrary from the *one Altar* mention'd in *Igna. ad magna.* p. 34.

P. 149. He thinks *Ignatius* does not intend one place by ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, becauſe he ſpeaks a little after of the *Unity of their Faith.* Might they not have Unity of Faith in one place? But we have ſufficiently prov'd above, That *Ignatius* his Church ordinarily met in one place.

Dr. *Burnet* acknowledges there was but *one Numerical Altar* to one Dioceſs, in *Ignatius*'s time, as *F. O.* quoted him, *P.* 30. Mr. *G.* paſſes by the Biſhop unſaluted. The Learned Mr. *Mede* confeſſeth, That in thoſe Firſt Times, they had but one Altar to a Dioceſan Church. This he confirms by Inſtances out of *Juſtin Martyr*, and out of *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 40. 72, 73. *De Unit. Eccl.* &c. *Mede* of Churches, *P.* 48, 49, 50.

I will not contend with him about the number of Churches built at *Conſtantinople*, by *Conſtantine the Great*; but 'tis very improbable that they ſhould be *two Hundred*, as he extravagantly talks. *Socrates* mentions but *Two*, *Nicephorus* ſpeaks of *Three Great* Temples, whereof that of *Sophia*, which he aſcribes to *Conſtantine*, was built by *Conſtantius* his Son, and was but an Addition to the Temple of *Irene*.

He ſpeaks alſo of Four or Five leſſer Oratories, (which were probably like our Chapels) one of which did bear the Name of the Apoſtles, the other of ſome Martyrs *. * *Niceph. Eccl. Hiſt.* VII. 49.

This may well agree with *Euſebius*'s Account, *viz.* That he built there many Oratories, and ſplendid Houſes of God †. *Euſebius* magnifies all the Actions of *Conſtantine*, and would not have omitted ſuch a Number of Temples, as the Rector fancies to be there. † *Vid. Con.* III. 47.

Ignatius exhorts *Polycarp*, *Not to neglect the Widows, to be their Curator after the Lord —— to have frequent Aſſemblies, to ſeek all by Name, and not to deſpiſe the Men-Servants, and Maid-Servants.* *Ign. ad Pol.* p. 12, 13.

Here *Polycarp* is, firſt, to take care of the Poor Widows, who were to be Relieved by him, or by his Order. This he could not well do, without ſome knowledge of them.

2. To have frequent Church-Meetings, and to ſeek all by Name, who ought to frequent the Publick Aſſemblies.

3. He muſt not neglect the very Servants, or Slaves, but Exhort them *not to be puffed up, but to Serve for the Glory of God, that they may receive of God a more glorious Liberty. Ign. Ibid.* He ſpeaks of Chriſtian Slaves, and ſuch as frequented their Church Aſſemblies.

What can the *Rector* ſay to this plain Quotation that carries it's own Evidence with it?

Ζητεῖ in the New Teſtament, ſaith he, *ſignifies to ſeek the Converſion of Unbelievers*, Luke 19. 10. *And* P. 152.

if

if Polycarp *muſt ſeek the Converſion of every ſingle Perſon in* Smyrna, *and deal with every one of them, then* J. O. *has reduced this great City to a ſmall Village.*

This is a *Chimera* of his own; *Ignatius* ſpeaks of Believing Servants, as is evident, and ſo *J. O.* applied it to prove the extent of *Polycarp*'s Church, *Plea, p.* 34. But our Author either wilfully or ignorantly, confounds the Church of *Smyrna*, and the City of *Smyrna*.

P. 153. To ſeek all by Name, ſaith he, *is to be underſtood not of every individual Perſon, but of all States and Conditions of Men, even the loweſt of them, the Slaves.*

This is a very poor Evaſion. *Ignatius* ſpeaks of Religious Aſſemblies, and of a Paſtoral Care, that the Biſhop muſt ſeek all by Name, the Servants not excepted. He muſt take care of his whole Flock, and not deſpiſe poor Servants. ἐξ ὀνόματος, by Name, cannot admit of any other tolerable Senſe.

* *Ad Polyc.* p. 16. *Ignatius*, in the ſame Epiſtle, explains himſelf, when he ſaith, *I Salute all by Name* *, and *ſome* of *them*

† *Ad Eph.* p. 29. he Names there. And in another place he ſaith, *Ye do all of you commonly, even every Man by Name,* (ἐξ ονόματος) *meet together in Jeſus Chriſt* †.

By Name here reſpects every individual Perſon, and not the ſeveral States and Conditions of Men. For every Member of the Church ordinarily attended Publick Ordinances, and not ſome of all Degrees only. *Ignatius*, in both places, ſpeaks of Church-Aſſemblies, where every one by Name was to attend, and the Biſhop muſt ſee that they did ſo, and not over-look the meaneſt Servants.

Suppoſe his Dioceſan required the Rector *to ſeek all his Pariſhoners by Name, and not to deſpiſe the Servants.* I queſtion whether he could ſatisfie the Biſhop: I am ſure he cannot acquit himſelf to the *chief Biſhop of our Souls*, by telling Him he took care of ſome of all States and Conditions, as well Servants as

as Maſters, as well *Mechanicks*, *as Rich Shop-Keepers*, as he ſpeaks. P. 153.

ἐξ ὀνόμα]Θ is not to be found in the Scriptures to which he refers, *Mat.* 10. 41, 42. *Eph.* 1. 21. And therefore they are improperly Alledged.

Mark 16. 15. is as little to the purpoſe. The Apoſtles could not poſſibly Preach the Goſpel to every individual Creature, but a Biſhop might ſeek all his Flock by Name.

If you will not allow him, That *to ſeek all by Name*, is to be underſtood of all States of Men, he has found out another ſhift. *Take Care of all by Name*, ſaith he, *i. e. give it in Charge to thy Presbyters and Deacons* to do ſo. P. 155.

This is a Figment of the Rector's own Brain, which he doth not pretend to ground upon any Paſſage in *Ignatius*. He fancies the Primitive Biſhops to be like thoſe of the latter Ages, who *enlarged* their Dioceſſes, and *diminiſhed* their care of the Flock: The Ancient Biſhops took care of the Flock in their own Perſons, and not by Proties.

'Tis true, they had their Aſſiſting Preſbyters, and Govern'd the Church by their United Councils, the Biſhop doing nothing without his Preſbyters, nor they without the Biſhop.

'Tis evident to any one that reads *Ignatius* his Epiſtle to *Polycarp*, that he ſpeaks of Perſonal Duties, *ſeek all by Name*, and a little after, ſaith he, *avoid evil Arts* *. The *Rector* may as well ſay, He muſt *avoid evil Arts by his Presbyters*, *as ſeek all by Name by them*.

* τὰς κακοτεχνίας, &c.

Our Author offers one *Obſervation* (for he will not be too prodigal on ſo tender a Subject) *to prove that the Church of* Smyrna *conſiſted of more Congregations than one*. P. 13.

'Tis the Firſt Proof of this kind he has given us, (though we have given ſeveral to the contrary) and therefore deſerves regard.

My Obſervation is this, ſaith he, *how that* Ignatius *(Parag. penult. of the Epiſtle to the* Smyrnæans*) thus* P. 155, 156.

Addreſſes

Addreſſes to the Biſhop. It will be fit, O moſt worthy Polycarp, *to gather* συμβούλιον θεοπρεπέσαλον, *a moſt Venerable and Auguſt Aſſembly, &c. This implies a great number of Presbyters and Deacons: Either then the Biſhop of* Smyrna *had many Congregations under him, or this little Church, (as* J. O. *believes it,) Swarm'd with a number of Idle, and Unneceſſary Presbyters, which no Man in his Wits will believe.*

P. 155. 1. This Argument he *thinks better than any* J. O. *has produced to the contrary, unleſs he flatters himſelf by an unuſual Charientiſm.*

It is poſſible a Man of Mr. *G*'s. Character may *Flatter himſelf*, whether it be *unuſual* with him to do ſo, I leave the Reader to paſs Judgment.

2. His Quotation is not in the Epiſtle to the *Smyrnæans*, as he affirms, but in the Epiſtle to *Polycarp* *, who was Biſhop of *Smyrna*, which I ſuppoſe might occaſion his miſtake. The Epiſtle to the *Smyrnæans*, has no ſuch Paſſage.

* *Ign. ad Polycarp.* p. 15.

3. The Preſbyters were the Biſhop's συμβούλιον, his *Council*, and the Church in *Ignatius's* time was Govern'd by the Biſhop and Preſbyters in common. He calls them προκαθέμενοι, *Preſidents* †. They were συνέδριον τῦ ἐπισκόπε, *The Biſhop's Council* ‖, and his *Complex Spiritual Crown* §, that ſate round about him. He calls them in another place, τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις, the Preſbyters that were with the Biſhop *. They lived with the Biſhop, and managed the Concerns of the Church in common; they did nothing without the Biſhop, nor he without them. Hence *Ignatius* Exhorts the *Magneſians* to do nothing without the Biſhop and Preſbyters †. No Church Aſſembly was held without them ‖.

† *Ign. ad Magn.* p. 33.

‖ *Ad Phil.* p. 43.

§ *Ad Mag.* p. 37.

* *Ad Phil.* p. 39.

† *Ign.* p. 33.

‖ χωρὶς τέτων ἐκκλησία ὐ καλεῖται. *Ad Tral.* p. 48.

It does not appear by the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, that the Preſbyters were Govern'd by the Biſhop, or Subject to him, they were joynt Governours of the Church, only the Biſhop was chief, for Orders ſake. The Deacons were Subject to the Biſhops and Preſbyters §, but the Preſbyters were not Subject

§ *Ad Mag.* p. 31.

to

to the Bishop. It's true, they cou'd do nothing without him, no more could he without them.

4. It does not appear that συμβούλιον θεοπρεπέστατον, *The God-becoming Assembly*, (not *most Venerable and August*, as he renders it) consisted only of the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, as he suggests. It should seem rather that it was a *Church-Assembly*, under the Conduct of the Bishop and Presbyters, who were desired to send a Message to the Church of *Antioch*, to comfort them in the Absence of their Bishop.

The next Paragraph confirms this Sense: *Write*, saith *Ignatius* to *Polycarp*, *to other Churches, that they do the same thing; such as are able may send Foot-Messengers, others may send Letters by thy Messengers.* Ad Polyc. p. 15.

In the same manner he speaks to the Church of *Philadelphia*, *It becomes you, as the Church of God, to appoint a Deacon to perform there* (at Antioch) *the Message of God. He adds a little after, some near Churches have sent Bishops, and some have sent Presbyters and Deacons* *. * Ad Phil. p. 45.

It was the manner in those First Ages to send Epistles and Messengers, in the Name of the whole Church, as appears by the Epistles written by the Churches of *Vienne* and *Lions*, to the Churches of *Asia* and *Phrygia*, concerning the Sufferings of the *Gallic Christians* †. † Euseb. Eccl. Hist. V. 1.

Therefore *Ignatius* his συμβούλιον θεοπρεπέστατον, seems to be an Assembly of the whole Church. *Ignatius* calls the Church of *Smyrna* θεοπρεπέστατη, *Deo-decentissima* in two places ‖. ‖ Ign. ad Smyr. p. 1. & p. 8.

5. Suppose this συμβούλιον θεοπρεπέστατον, *God-becoming Assembly*, had consisted of the Bishop and his Presbyters, it will not follow that there were a great number of Presbyters.

Ignatius abounds with Epithets, and such as may seem, if not swelling, at least Superfluous. He gives to the *Roman* Church Nine or Ten big Epithets, in one breath, as ἀξιόθεον, ἀξιοπρεπῆ, ἀξιομακάριστον,

μακαρίστος, &c. He calls his Bonds, *God-becoming Bonds*, δεσμῶν θεοπρεπεστάτοις δεσμοῖς *.

* *Ad Smyr.* p. 8.

He Stiles the Biſhop of *Smyrna* ἀξιόθεον, *worthy of God*, and the Preſbytery, θεοπρεπέστατον, *becoming God*. As one Biſhop is *God-worthy*, ſo a few Preſbyters may be *God-becoming*.

6. *F. O.* doth not ſay the Church of *Smyrna* was a little Church, it might be a large Church, (as many Pariſh-Churches are) and find work enough for ſeveral Preſbyters with the Biſhop. What he ſaith of the *Aſian* Angels hath been conſider'd before.

P. 156, & 157.

He wonders that *F. O.* ſhould ſay, *The Authorized Bibles call the Angels Miniſters*, not Biſhops. *F. O.* added, "This ſhews the Senſe of the Old "Church of *England*, agreeable to many of the An-"cients, ſuch as *Aretas*, *Primoſius*, *Ambroſe*, *Gregory* "*the Great*, *Bede*, *Haymo*, &c.

P. 157,

This he wiſely over-looks: but asks, *What if a Man ſhould ſay they expreſſed themſelves too looſly and negligently?*

They expreſſed their own Senſe, and that of the Ancient Church. They could eaſily have call'd the Angels *Biſhops*, had they thought them ſo. Our firſt Reformers were not ſuch looſe, negligent Souls, as ſome of thoſe who pretend to Correct them, evidence themſelves to be.

After having ſpent ſome Pages in ſuch Scornful Reflections as may become him, but would ſcarce drop from a Scholar, or a Gentleman, eſpecially when no Provocation is given, he proceeds to an Ingenuous Confeſſion of the weakneſs of this Argument for Biſhops from the *Aſian* Angels.

It would have been a *ſtrange Conſequence*, he acknowledges, that Angels ſhould be expounded Biſhop, one that had Authority over other Miniſters, *had not be read in* Paul's Two Epiſtles, *That* Timothy *had Authority over the whole Church of* Epheſus, *and again in* Ignatius, *That there was a Biſhop of* Epheſus.

P. 160.

If

If these two Evidences fail him, as I have proved they do, this of the *Asian* Angels falls of it self.

Our Author is very angry with *J. O.* for saying that "St. *John* placeth the Presbyters next the "Throne of Christ, and the Angels at a greater "distance, *Rev.* 5. 11. Shall we therefore say the "Presbyters are more worthy than the Bishops? "The Inference is much more natural than the "other, if Angels be Bishops. Thus *J. O.* P. 161.

This plain Scripture-Observation, doth so move the Rector's Choler, that he cannot forbear his old Railing Language. *If* J. O. *says he, has managed this Argument Honestly and Sincerely, I'll henceforward renounce all pretence to those scurvie Pieces of Morality.*

1. He himself acknowledges, that the Words may bear that Sense *J. O.* puts upon them: that ζώων and πεσσαρῶν may be Govern'd of κυκλόθεν, or coupled with θρόνε, and so the Angels being round about the Throne, and round about the Elders, it follows the Elders were nearer the Throne. Why doth not he disprove this Sense? A Scholar should use Arguments, and not *Billingsgate*-Dialect.

2. This Construction of the Words is not new; their admired *Grotius* saith, that the Angels are in the remoteſt place: so do several others, and it seems agreeable with their Office of Guarding the Church, *Psal.* 34. 7. *Angeli ponuntur in extimo ambitu Grot. in Loc.*

Where then is the *dishonesty* and *insincerity* of managing this Argument? Is it in saying, That the Inference is more natural, that Presbyters are more Honourable than Bishops, if Angels be Bishops? Why does he not disprove this Inference? *J. O.* did not urge this Scripture as a concluding Argument, but to shew the weakness of the Argument for the Superiority of Bishops. *They are Angels, therefore they are Superiour to Presbyters.* I say still, *J. O's.* Inference is much more Natural, If Bishops be Angels, and Angels be remoter from the Throne

of Chriſt than Elders, Elders are more Honourable than Biſhops.

So then *J. O.* has managed this Argument *honeſtly and ſincerely*, for any thing the Rector hath ſaid to the contrary.

I would wiſh him to conſult the Honour of his Profeſſion a little better, than to perform his raſh Promiſe of *Renouncing henceforward all pretence to thoſe ſcurvy Pieces of Morality*, as he ſcurvily calls them. His Caſuiſts will tell him, That an immoral Promiſe is better broken than kept.

It would raiſe ones Stomach to ſee him compare *Timothy* with *Judas*. *'Tis no more impoſſible*, ſaith he, *that* Timothy *ſhould leave his firſt Love*, Rev. 2.2.
P. 162. *than that* Judas *the Apoſtle ſhould betray his Maſter. We muſt not think but that ſome of the Apoſtles, Friends and Diſciples, made Ship-wrack of the Faith.* Alexander *did ſo*, Acts 19. 33. *And why not* Timothy; *ſo did* Demas.

The Apoſtle ſaith of *Timothy*, *There was no Man like-minded*, Phil. 2. 20, 22. And that there were *Prophecies* concerning him, that he ſhould War a good Warfare, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. Can any ſuch thing be ſaid of *Judas?* We ſay, *Compariſons are odious*, was there ever a *more odious one*, than to compare one of the moſt excellent New Teſtament *Saints*, with the vileſt of Hypocrites? I will refer him to his own Words, if it be not offenſive to him to review them. *Criticks will be buſie, and advance Pa-*
P. 163. *radoxes, and who can help it? Timothy* ſhall be an *Apoſtate*-Biſhop, *rather than no Biſhop.* But he thinks to mend the Matter, by ſuppoſing *Timothy might be dead*, when *the Revelation was written, becauſe he was an infirm Man*, 1 Tim. 5. 23. *and would ſcarce live to Seventy Years.* We have known infirm Men that were Temperate, to live above Seventy. *J. O.* obſerv'd, that many Chronologers affirm'd, that *Timothy* was alive then. This he overlooks. *J. O.* ſhew'd out of Dr. *Lightfoot*, That the Angel of the Church

Church was a *Parish-Bishop*, in Conformity to the *Jewish* Synagogues, each of which had its *Angel*, or *Bishop*.

Our Author here enters the Lists with Dr. *Lightfoot*, not with *J. O. He hath not shew'd us*, saith he, *that every Synagogue had a Presbytery*. P. 164, 165.

Let him consult Dr. *Lightf.* Vol. 1. p. 302. & p. 611. & Vol. II. p. 133.

But the Rulers of the Synagogues, adds he, *were subject to the High-Priests, and their Presbytery*. P. 165.

So are the Presbyters to Jesus Christ, our great High-Priest, and to all Rulers of his appointment. He told us above, That the High-Priest and Presbytery were the chief Court of Judicature among the Jews, and had the highest Jurisdiction: And so it had in things Civil and Sacred. What is this to Episcopal Power over the Presbyters? Let the Bishops produce as clear a Charter for their Order, as the High Priests did for theirs, and we'll submit.

He remembers Mr. Bois *scoffs at the Bishop of* L. *for Arguing with Dr.* Lightfoot, but does not refer to the place, lest we should see what *great Reason* Mr. *B.* might have to reject *Rabbinical Traditions*, and what little reason our Author had to charge him with *scoffing*. P. 166.

When Rabbinical Learning is of any advantage, we are content to make use of it, if against us, we deride it, saith he. P. 167.

When it is against the Truth we reject it; when there is a Harmony between it, and the New Testament, we receive it not for *Confirmation* of Divine Truth, but for *Illustration*. Mr. *G.* cannot deny but the Minister of every Synagogue was *call'd the Angel of the Church*, and *Bishop of the Congregation*, as Dr. *Lightfoot* hath prov'd: Therefore it looks highly rational that the *Angels of the* Asian *Churches* should be so called, in Allusion to the Ministers of the Synagogue. Christian Oratories are

call'd Synagogues, *James* 2. 2. Our Author cannot deny the Agreement in many things between both: But, says he, *The Temple-Worship, whereof a great deal was Moral, was as much the Pattern of the Christian, as was the Synagogue-Worship:* and if so, *the Jewish Priest-hood was the Pattern of the Christian Hierarchy*, p. 166.

1. The Jewish Priesthood was appropriated to the Ceremonial Worship of the Temple, though they perform'd the Moral parts there also. The Legal Priests, and the Legal Altar, were *Relates*, *Heb.* 7. 13, 14. and both were Abolished together, *Heb.* 7. 12. *For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law.* What Law? not that which concern'd the Moral Worship, but the Law of Ceremonies, to which the Levitical Priesthood was adapted.

* *Light.* Vol. II. p. 133, 134, 135.

2. The *Moral Worship* in the Synagogues might be performed by such as were no Priests *, but none but Priests gave attendance at the Altar, *Heb.* 7. 13. Therefore the Ceremonial Worship, Temple, and Priesthood, being Abolished, and the Moral Worship (which was the only Synagogue-Worship) being Transplanted into the Christian Church, it follows that the *Jewish Priesthood* was no Pattern of the Gospel-Ministry. But this has been consider'd before.

J. O.'s First Instance of Ordination by Presbyters, from *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. hath been sufficiently vindicated above, *Cap.* 2.

P. 168. He is in one of his *hot Fits* again, and Charges *J. O.* with insufferable *Artifice*, *Fallacy*, *Sophistry*, &c. for saying, "That if *Barnabas* was one of the "Seventy Disciples (as the Ancients affirm he was) "then was he of the Order of Presbyters, accord- "ing to that Hypothesis, that makes Bishops to suc- "ceed the Twelve Apostles, and Presbyters the "Seventy Disciples,

J. O.

F. O. did not call *Barnabas* a Presbyter, but argued *ad hominem*.

He might as well have affirm'd, saith he, *That* Matthias, *another of the Seventy, was but a Presbyter, who succeeded* Judas.

We read of *Matthias* his Solemn Call to the Apostleship, and that he was Numbred with the Eleven, *Acts* 1. 26. but we have not the like account of *Barnabas*.

'Tis true, he is call'd an Apostle, *Acts* 14. 4. 14. so are Evangelists sometimes, as we proved before. Many conceive he was but an Evangelist. *Paul* seems to own no Apostles in a strict Sense, but the Twelve and himself, 1 *Cor.* 15. 5, 7, 8. It was the Prerogative of the Apostles to confer the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, but we do not find that *Barnabas* ever confer'd that Gift. Though I will not be positive but he might be a real Apostle.

F. O. Argued, " That those who have power to " Dispense the Gospel, to Baptize, and Administer " the Lord's Supper, have also Power of Ordina- " tion, because these are Ordinances not inferiour " to Ordination. *Et parium par est ratio.* They are " not inferiour to Ordination.

" 1. Preaching the Gospel is not inferiour to Or- " dination. The Publishers of it are *Ambassadors* for " Christ, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. represent the great Prophet " of the Church, *Mat.* 5. 20. are Workers together " with God, 2 *Cor.* 6. 1. And is an Ordainer more " than this?

" Baptism is our Solemn Dedication to God. Or- " dination is no more, only the former is to Chri- " stianity as such, the latter to a particular work.

" 2. Baptism is a Sacramental Dedication, which " Ordination is not.

" 3. In the Lord's Supper, the Minister sets apart " Bread and Wine, as Symbolical Representations " of Jesus Christ. *Ferom* saith of Presbyters, *Ad* " *quorum preces Corpus & Sanguis Christi conficitur.*

" Now which is greater, to Impoſe Hands, or to " make the Sacramental Body and Blood of Jeſus " Chriſt? If they have Power to Conſecrate Ho- " ly Things, why not Holy Perſons alſo? Thus *J. O.* who prov'd alſo, that the Miniſterial Acts now mention'd, are not inferiour to Ordination, from 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20.

P. 170. What can our Author ſay to this? Inſtead of anſwering *J. O.*'s Arguments, he ſaith, *He knows not by what Authority J. O. has enter'd into the Compariſon.*

His Scripture-Reaſons are his Authority, which Mr. *G.* has not touched; only he nibbles at 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. which is a Text, ſaith he, *that few underſtand*; but at length he gives the meaning of it.

P. 171. *Paul's main work*, ſaith he, *was to Preach, not to Baptize.*

If Preaching was his *main Work*, it was not inferiour to Ordination.

P. 172. *It doth not hence follow, that Preaching is a more honourable Office than Baptizing*, ſaith the Rector.

None ever affirm'd the Office to be more Honourable, for the *Office* is one and the ſame; Preaching and Baptizing are Acts of one and the ſame *Office*. The Apoſtle ſeems to prefer the Work of Preaching, before that of Baptizing: ſo doth Chriſt alſo, who Preached Himſelf, but committed the Work of Baptizing to his Diſciples, *John* 4. 2.

Though he blames *J. O.* for comparing Miniſterial Acts, yet he cannot forbear doing it himſelf.

P. 173. *Ordaining*, ſaith he, *is a higher Miniſterial Act than Baptizing. Turpe eſt Doctori, cùm culpa redarguit ipſum.*

J. O. thinks " Chriſt mentioned the chief part " of a Miniſter's Work in *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Go* " *Teach, Baptize*, &c. If Ordination had been the " main and chiefeſt part of the Apoſtle's Com- " miſſion, He would have ſaid, *Go, Ordain, Preach,* " *Baptize*, &c. Ordination therefore is not the " principal

" principal part of a Minister's Office, but rather " Subordinate to Preaching and Baptizing, and in- " cluded here, as the Lesser in the Greater. A Com- " mission usually Specifies the principal Acts which " one is impowered to do, and do not run *à minori* " *ad majus.*

Mr. *G.* takes no notice of *J. O's* Argument, but pretends that the Reason why *the Lord's Supper, and Ordination are not mention'd in* Mat. 28. 19, 20. *is because they were mentioned before*, Luke 22. 19. John 20. 21. *Ibid.*

So Teaching and Baptizing were mentioned before, and practised by the Apostles. Christ gives them no new Commission at this time, only enlargeth their former Commission: They Taught and Baptized before, but in one Nation only, now they are sent *to all Nations.*

It is agreed, that *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. contains the Commission, not only of the Apostles, but of their *Successors*, to the end of Time, for the Work of the Ministry, *v.* 20. *I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.*

Either this Commission doth impower them to Ordain Successors, in the ordinary part of their Ministry, or it doth not; if it doth not, it's imperfect and insufficient for the continuance of a Gospel-Ministry unto the end of the World, in pursuance of the Promise made to that end, *v.* 20. Ordination is not mentioned in *John* 20. 21. and it must needs be implied in *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. as a necessary means for the continuance of the Church unto the end of Time.

If this Commission in *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. doth impower the Apostles to Ordain, as doubtless it doth, then the Ordaining Power must be included in *Teaching* and *Baptizing*, as Subordinate and Subservient to them.

He says, *The Power of Conferring other Powers, is greater than those other Powers*, John 13. 16. P. 174.

If this be true, the Biſhops who make an Arch-Biſhop are greater than he: And thoſe who Conſecrate the Pope are greater than the Pope. *John* 13. 16. doth not ſpeak of Ordination, all that can be gathered from it is, That we ſhould learn Humility of Jeſus Chriſt, who is our Lord and Maſter, *John* 13. 13, 14, 15, 16.

Inferiours often confer Superiour Powers: Biſhops do Crown Kings; a Recorder, or Town-Clerk, may Swear a Mayor.

'Tis endleſs to follow our Author in all his undigeſted Notions, and yet I cannot but touch on 'em, for the ſake of the leſs Judicious Readers, who expect his Book Anſwered Paragraph by Paragraph.

He affirms, but cannot prove, That the *Apoſtles*
P. 175. *reſerved Ordination to themſelves.* We have prov'd the contrary already. He aſks *with what Effrontery*
Ibid. *dares* J. O. *call* Peter Lombard *to his Aſſiſtance*, who ſays the Ancients argued from Baptiſm to Ordination. *Lomb.* Lib. 4. Diſt. 25.

I have Anſwered this alteady. In ſhort, the Teſtimony of an Adverſary is Valid againſt himſelf.

He acknowledges, That *if the Ordainirg Power,*
P. 176. *did by Scripture-Charter belong to the Presbyters, then to pretend to deprive 'em of it were a Nullity.*

I have proved that it does belong to them by Scripture-Charter: And therefore his Inſtance of a Preſbyter Baptizing a Believer, who hath no Power to Baptize another, is not to the purpoſe.

He has often profeſs'd, That he will not trace *J. O.* through the Fathers, and Ancient Writers: So he doth *p.* 122. and *p.* 175. and yet as a Man who is no Slave to his Word, he will needs be nibbling at Antiquity, where he thinks he has any advantage; ſo he does *p.* 116. and *p.* 119. and in the concluding Pages of his Book.

p. 177, 188. He makes a long ſtride from *p.* 58. of *J. O's.* Plea, to *p.* 179. and there he picks quarrel with

two

two Quotations of his, which ſhew the Preſbyters to Succeed the Apoſtles as much as the Biſhops. He ſkips over but 120 Pages of *F. O*'s. Book, and yet would perſuade the World he has Anſwer'd it. Suppoſe I had done ſo by his Book, (which I have anſwered in all that's material, Paragraph by Paragraph) would not ſome People be tempted to think it unanſwerable, and that I undertook what I was not able to perform. But to proceed to the Remarks on *F. O*'s. Quotations.

Ignatius ſaith, *That the Presbyters Succeeded in the place of the Bench of the Apoſtles.*

There's nothing more unfair, ſaith my Author, *than to miſrepreſent the Meaning of an Author.* P. 178.

F. O. only Quoted the Words, without Explication, how then could he miſrepreſent the meaning?

But the meaning is, as he tells us, *That the Presbyters are the Biſhops Seconds, as the Apoſtles were Jeſus Chriſt's Seconds.*

Our *Rector* wants a *Second* to explain his Explication, it is ſo obſcure and unintelligible.

I hope he would not make *Ignatius* ſay, that the Biſhops are as much the Head of the Preſbyters, as Chriſt is of the Apoſtles. But let's hear *Ignatius* himſelf. *I exhort you*, ſaith he, * *do all your Works in the Concord of God, the Biſhops preſiding in the place of God, and the Preshyters in the place of the Bench (or Council) of the Apoſtles, and the Deacons, who are precious to me, to whom is committed the Miniſtry of Jeſus Chriſt.* * *Ad Mag.* p. 33.

So in another place: *Let all of you follow the Biſhops, as Jeſus Chriſt followed the Father, and follow the Presbytery as the Apoſtles, and reverence the Deacons as the Command of God*+. + *Ign. ad Smyr*, p. 6.

He ſaith *one Biſhop, with the Presbytery and the Deacons.* And a little after, he calls the *Apoſtles, the Presbytery of the Church* ||. || *Ad Phil.* p. 41.

In another place, *Reverence the Deacons, as the Command of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Biſhop as Jeſus Chriſt,*

Christ, and the Presbyters as the Council of God, and the Conjunction of the Apostles. And a little before; *Be Subject to the Presbytery, as the Apostles of Jesus Christ* *.

* *Ad Tral.* p. 48.

He speaks more expresly a few Pages after, *Be inseparably United to God, Jesus Christ, and the Bishop, καὶ τῶν διαταγμάτων τῶν ἀποστόλων, and the Orders of the Apostles*, i. e. the Presbyters †.

† *Ibid.* p. 50.

I leave it to the Impartial Reader's Judgment, whether all these Expressions put together, do not make it plain, That the Presbyters according to *Ignatius*, Succeed the Apostles. Can any thing be express'd with more clearness? They preside in the place of the Bench of the Apostles. They must be followed as the Apostles, reverenc'd as the Conjunction of the Apostles, and as the Orders of Apostles.

But our Author proceeds in his usual and proper Stile.

P. 178. J. O's. *last disingenuous Perverting the Sense of* Ignatius, *has put me*, saith he, *upon the Examination of his Testimony out of* Irenæus. *For I must confess, I dare not trust him in any thing, that he offers out of Antiquity.*

See the Candor of this Gentleman, he declines *J. O*'s Testimonies out of Antiquity, and yet turns over above a Hundred Pages, to search out one or two Quotations that he may Cavil at them.

Having treated *J. O.* with such scornful and ill Language, so often in his Book, it is not to be expected he should forbear bestowing upon him some of his best Compliments now at parting. And he is the more obliged to him for them, because they are Undeserved, and are the free Emanations of the Rector's good Nature.

His attempt upon *Ignatius* failing him, he proceeds to *J. O*'s. Second Quotation out of *Irenæus*, which was this. *Cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem,*

nem, quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis, quæ per Succeſſionem Presbyteriorum in Eccleſiis cuſtoditur.

Here he *taxes* J. O's. *Sincerity, for a literal Fault* of the Printer's, who inſtead of *Presbyterorum* Printed *Presbyteriorum*, with the Addition of the Letter (*i*). This would paſs for a Venial Fault among Friends, but Mr. *G.* is as ſevere a Judge, as he is a Corrector of the Preſs. P. 179.

But, ſaith he, J. O. *like a Man wiſe in his Generation, turn'd Presbyters into Presbyteries, that this place may be underſtood not of Biſhops, but of the Colledges of Presbyters; but* Irenæus *by Presbyters means Biſhops.* *Ibid.*

1. *J. O.* ſpoke of Presbyters (not Preſbyteries) Succeeding the Apoſtles; and quoted *Irenæus* for Proof. He does not uſe the Word Preſbytery in all that Argument, *p.* 179, 180.

2. Mr. *G.* cannot deny but *Irenæus* ſaith, *the Presbyters Succeeded the Apoſtles*, but he thinks by *Presbyters he means Biſhops.* We think ſo too, and thence infer, That Preſbyters and Biſhops are the ſame in *Irenæus*, as they are in *Paul's* Epiſtles.

He ſaith in another place, *We muſt obey thoſe Presbyters that are in the Church, who received their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles* (as we have ſhewn) *who with the Succeſſion of their Epiſcopacy, have received the certain Grace of Truth, according to the Father's Pleaſure.* And a little after: *Such Presbyters the Church nouriſheth, of whom the Prophet ſaith*, I will give thee Rulers in Peace, and Biſhops in Righteouſneſs ||. || *Iren. ad Hæreſ.* IV. 43, 44.

Obſerve here, 1. That Preſbyters Succeed the Apoſtles. 2. Preſbyters have an Epiſcopacy. 3. Thoſe whom *Irenæus* calls Preſbyters, he calls alſo Biſhops. *Irenæus* his Biſhop was but the firſt Preſbyter, as *Hilarius* the *Roman* Deacon calls him *. * *Int. ad Epheſ.*

By thoſe firſt Preſbyters (who for Order ſake, had the precedency of the reſt) *Irenæus*, and others, derive the Succeſſion. But the Churches were Governed not by thoſe ſingle Preſbyters, or Biſhops

ſhops alone, but by the *College of Presbyters in common*, among whom the Senior Preſbyter, or the moſt worthy, had the πρωτοθρονία, or chief Seat, but without Power of Juriſdiction over his Brethren.

As the *Athenians* reckon'd the Years in which the *Archontes* Govern'd their Republic, by the firſt *Archon*, though there were *Nine* of them in all; and the *Lacedemonians* denominated the Years of their *Ephori* (who were Five in all) by the Name of the Firſt *; ſo the Fathers derive the Succeſſion of Preſbyters, by the Firſt and Chief Preſbyter, to whom the Name of Biſhop, by degrees, was appropriated.

*Vid. Blon. Apol. Pref. p. 38.

Thus we have Vindicated *Ignatius* and *Irenæus*, againſt the angry Exceptions of our Author. I will add one or two more, but with no deſign to ſtir up his Choler.

Jerom ſaith of them, *They* (the Clergy) *Succeed in the Apoſtolical Degree, they make the Body of Chriſt with their Sacred Mouths, and by them we are made Chriſtians.* He ſpeaks not of Biſhops, but of the *Clerici*, without Diſtinction, even of all that Adminiſter the Euchariſt, and Baptize. And a little after expreſly Names the Preſbyters. *The Presbyter*, ſaith he, *may deliver me to Satan, if I offend* †.

† *Hieron. Ep. ad Heliodor.*

Origen, in *Mat.* 16. makes all Preſbyters to ſucceed the Apoſtles, in the Power of the Keys.

Proſper makes all Holy Prieſts, that conſciencioufly diſcharge the Duties of their Office, the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.

" If the Holy Prieſts (ſaith he) turn many to " God, by their Holy Living and Preaching, who " can doubt ſuch to be Partakers of the Contem- " plative Vertue, by whoſe Example and Inſtructi- " on, many are made Heirs of the Kingdom of " Heaven? Theſe are the Miniſters of the Word, " the Hearers of God, the Oracles of the Holy " Spirit. Theſe are the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles of " the Lord *.

* *Iſti ſunt Apoſtolor. Domini Succeſſores Proſp. de Vit. Con. Templ. I.* 25.

The

The ſame is affirm'd by *Ambroſe*, * *Claves Regni Cœlorum in beato* Petro Apoſtolo, *cunctis ſuſcepimus Sacerdotes.* * *De dign. Sacerdot.* Cap. 1.

Cyprian alſo ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe. *Chriſt ſaith to the Apoſtles, and to all* (Eccleſiaſtical) *Rulers, who by a deputed Ordination Succeed the Apoſtles, he that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that heareth Me, heareth Him that ſent Me* †. † *Dicit ad omnes præpoſitos qui Apoſtolis vicaria ordinatione Succedunt.* Ep. LXIX.

I do not deny but *Cyprian* calls the Biſhops *Præpoſiti*, Church-Rulers, and ſpeaks here of himſelf, who was a Biſhop; but the Words are general, and muſt include the Preſbyters alſo.

1. Becauſe he ſaith, all the *Præpoſiti ſucceed the Apoſtles*, The Preſbyters, as well as the Biſhops, are the *Præpoſiti* in *Cyprian*, ſo he calls them, *The Lord choſe the Apoſtles, that is the Biſhops and Præpoſitos* *, Rulers. Here *Cyprian* calls the Preſbyters *Præpoſitos*, and he makes the *Biſhops* and the *Præpoſiti* equally to Succeed the Apoſtles. *Ep LXV.

2. He ſaith, all the *Præpoſiti* Succeed the Apoſtles, to whom Chriſt ſayeth, *he that heareth you, heareth Me.* Now theſe Words of Chriſt belong to the Preſbyters, as much as to the Biſhops. *He that heareth* them, *heareth Chriſt.* Therefore theſe Words were ſpoken to them alſo, *as the Apoſtles Succeſſors*, according to *Cyprian*, And this is agreeable to the 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. where the Apoſtle *Peter*, Writing to to Preſbyters, calls himſelf a *Presbyter.* Had the Apoſtle written thus: *The Biſhops which are among you, I exhort, who am alſo a Biſhop*; this would have been cried up for an Invincible Argument, to prove that Biſhops were the Apoſtles Succeſſors, for he Writes to Biſhops, and calls himſelf a Biſhop. The Argument is ours, to prove that Preſbyters ſucceed the Apoſtles, (who Stile themſelves Preſbyters) in the ordinary part of their Office. We do not deny but the Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles, but as *Preſbyters*,

hyters, and not as an Order of Church-Officers, Superiour to Presbyters; and therefore *Irenæus*, as we observed before, saith, *The Presbyters Succeed the Apostles*, making Presbyters and Bishops to be the same, according to the Holy Scriptures.

I have already prov'd, That the Presbyters of *Ephesus* Succeeded the Apostle in the Government of that Church. *Timothy* was left there in *Paul*'s Absence, when he intended to come to *Ephesus* himself shortly, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. & 4. 13. The Presbyters were entrusted with the Government of the Church, when he had no Thoughts of seeing them again, *Acts* 20. 25. 38.

Timothy, an Evangelist, was to supply the Temporary Absence of *Paul* from that Church, the Presbyters his perpetual Absence, and therefore are properly his *Successors* in the Government of that Church.

F I N I S.